The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

THE Prime Minister has never concealed his conviction that the war would be long and hard and full of setbacks and surprises. The first quarter of 1942 has indeed shown him to be a true prophet. At the same time our people, though bewildered and disappointed, are still undaunted and quite sure of victory in the long run. It is said that the British never know when they are beaten; that is because they never are beaten in spirit and resolve. They "are baffled to fight better: fall to rise". That has never been more conspicuously true than it is now. By the time these words appear in print it may be that we shall have suffered more reverses, or it may be that the tide will have begun to turn. But in any case we shall hold on united and undismayed. The enemy has had all the advantage that surprise and treachery could give, but the slowly mounting might of the British Empire, of Russia, America, and China will surely overwhelm him in the end. Then we shall be confronted with the grim task and heavy responsibility of building a new world. May we be ready for it and worthy of it.

* * *

ONCE more the Editor of the *Quarterly* has left us for a preaching and lecturing tour in Canada and the United States, and we wish him *bon voyage,* good success, and a safe return. Dr. Peel has already made many contacts on the other side, and has proved himself *persona grata* with American audiences. They know that he does not bring them propaganda which they do not want, but information which they do, and they are grateful accordingly. Nothing is more important in world politics just now than the establishing of a better understanding and more cordial co-operation between the British Empire and the United States of America. There is still much ignorance and some prejudice on both sides, and it will not be overcome without strenuous and well-directed efforts. The encouragement of the study of history is all to the good, as is also the study of literature. But it is said that more English books are read in America than are American books in England. If so, that must be corrected, though war conditions will make it more difficult.

Here the Churches can help. They are doing a good deal already. Interchange of preachers has been going on for a good

many years now, as has also the holding of such Conferences as the International Congregational Council alternately in America and this country. There has also been some interchange of students theological and otherwise, and here the Rhodes foundation has been of inestimable service. All these efforts will have to be extended and intensified after the war. Further, it is high time that Christian people and preachers in England knew more of the very real and fruitful contribution which American writers are now making to the study of theology. Experts in various branches of the subject have long been fully aware of the debt they owe to American fellow workers, but something more than that is needed. There is growing up on the other side of the Atlantic a school of younger theologians whose work is of the first importance. Men like Niebuhr, Bennett, Van Dusen, Horton, Morrison, and many others deserve to be more widely known and studied on this side. They have a message of their own and it is worth listening to. In their freedom from ecclesiastical bias and their more realistic and empirical outlook they have much to teach us. It may be that in the future we shall find in America something of that theological stimulus and inspiration which we have found hitherto, perhaps too exclusively, in Germany.

* * *

We have received a pamphlet by the Rev. H. Bulcock entitled *A Modern Churchman's Manual* (The Blackheath Press, 6d.). Like everything that Mr. Bulcock writes, it is clear, competent, and scholarly, but we cannot avoid the feeling that it attempts far too much. To treat, even summarily, all the great problems of Christian theology and philosophy in a booklet of thirty-six pages is a task beyond the power of any man. Mr. Bulcock does his best, but in trying to be comprehensive he only becomes complicated, and he has succeeded in producing neither a manual nor a *confessio fidei* nor a system of doctrine, but something of all three. Like most modernists he protests too much. Most of what he has written would be accepted by all intelligent students of the subject, though they might not express it quite in the same terms, and Mr. Bulcock is ready to admit that in regard to many of the questions he raises there is room for "reasonable and healthy variety of opinion".

That being so, we find it very difficult to justify the existence of an organization like the Modern Free Churchman's Union. Its aim, as stated, is "the presentation of the Christian faith in the light of contemporary thought and experience, with an emphasis on the need for reality in Christian worship, teaching, and conduct". What could be more unexceptionable than this, and where are the Christians who would not heartily accept it as an aim ever to be kept before them? The trouble, of course, begins when we

try to define our terms and to give chapter and verse for this modern and realist interpretation of the Christian faith. The modernist has his own way of doing this, and it is as distinctive and just as dogmatic as the way of the Catholic or the Evangelical. They have, no doubt, much to learn from him, but he has also much to learn from them, and none of them has any monopoly of the truth. But so long as they are intent on seeking the truth and nothing but the truth we may bid them all godspeed for in the multitude of counsellors there is wisdom. It is another story, however, when it comes to setting up a special organization within a Church or Denomination for the defence and furtherance of a particular theological fashion or attitude. Such organizations, societies, unions, or whatever they are called are bound to be divisive and disruptive. They encourage propaganda and proselytizing. They become one-sided and tend to over-emphasize non-essentials. Congregationalism at any rate has no use for this kind of thing. We pride ourselves on our freedom. We have kept the faith without any binding creeds to compel us. But we have always allowed for variety of opinion and testimony. We have had our right and left wings and they have lived together without much trouble. We know that our freedom is threatened by modernists quite as much as by fundamentalists. Therefore we are tempted to say "a plague on both your houses". There is much to be learned from the parable of the tares and the wheat.

* * *

THE Battle of the Books is not the least important of the many conflicts which are raging just now. It would appear that the output of books is about half the normal, and the trade is threatened with still further restrictions owing to the acute shortage of paper. Protests and objections are too easily silenced and rebuked by the familiar cry, "There is a war on, and everything must be subordinated to the task of winning it". By all means; but let us be quite sure that we do bring everything into this common effort. It is not just a question of supplying munitions and other material aids to victory. There are, as has so often been pointed out, mental and spiritual resources which have their own part to play in the national effort and which we shall neglect at our peril. One of the best ways of strengthening morale, and of keeping "an even mind amid misfortunes", is the reading of good books. The wholesale burning of books that were thought to be in conflict with the Nazi ideology was not only an act of criminal folly but a tacit admission of the power of literature to shape the mind and ideals of a nation. So the growing demand of our own men in the Forces for books of all kinds, good, bad, and indifferent, points to the same end. It is said, however, and with some justice, that in view of the present stringency there ought to be more dis-

crimination in the output of books. Complaint is made that while a good deal of ephemeral rubbish manages to get published standard works and books that are a real contribution to knowledge are often held up. Light literature, of course, we must have, but not to the exclusion of serious works. It would almost seem, therefore, as though some form of censorship would be justified, at least for the duration. There is something to be said also for the suggestions recently put forward by Mr. Reginald Smith in a small book, *Towards a Living Encyclopædia* (Dakers Ltd., 2s.). His contention is that "in the practical cultural and spiritual realms alike, the work of correlation is needed in the hope that it may help one generation to pass on the best of its experience to the next, in the way that is so necessary to any ordered human progress, or even preservation, and in which we have so conspicuously failed in this century to do it". He therefore proposes a scheme for bringing together "readers, publishers and writers to co-operate on new principles in bringing order out of the whole chaos of the printed word". How this is to be done Mr. Smith sets forth in his book—not always very clearly. His scheme, too, seems rather too grandiose and premature. But in at least raising the subject for discussion he has done good service. In view of the present distress there can hardly be two opinions as to the need for more co-ordination in action and pooling of resources. It is not easy to see what practical steps can be taken just now, apart from urging a closer co-operation among all concerned. But in the new world we hope to see after the war there may be a better chance.

Mr. Stanley Unwin brings up the whole problem again in a small pamphlet entitled *The Status of Books* (Allen & Unwin, 3d.). He presents an unanswerable case for books as necessary instruments of civilization, and shows just how little is required in order to keep up the supply. "Granted that books *are* wanted, the problem of securing their supply even in war time is almost childishly simple, because so comparatively little is involved whether of materials or labour. The present allocation of paper for books represents at most 1¼ per cent of the total consumption. A further 2,000 tons a quarter, which would still leave the proportion less than 1¾ per cent, would suffice for war time needs and enable at least a small start to be made on the urgent work of replacing the millions of copies of standard works destroyed by enemy action. Even this small tonnage would be manufactured from home produced material, so that no question of shipping space is involved".

Only a very ignorant and unimaginative statesmanship could turn a deaf ear to this appeal.

* * *

In the last number of the *Quarterly* Dr. Peel expressed regret that Dr. Vernon Bartlet had left so little published work behind him.

His regret is shared by many, and I am glad therefore to be able to report that something is being done to remedy the defect. Bartlet left behind him a vast mass of papers, but in so chaotic a condition that nothing could be done with them. We did, however, discover among them an almost complete typescript of the Birkbeck lectures which Bartlet gave at Cambridge some years ago and had always intended to print. Their subject is "Church Life and Order in the first Four Centuries", and they form a most illuminating contribution to the study of an obscure feature of Church history. They deal exhaustively with such topics as the Didache, the Didascalia, Serapions prayer book and the Apostolic Constitutions. They well illustrate the mind and method of their author—his wealth of learning, accurate scholarship, and cautious judgment. Though they will appeal mainly to students of theology they have a wider interest. They throw a great deal of light on the process whereby when the Spirit of God has created an institution the institution then, as it were, turns round and quenches the Spirit, or in other words, how order tends to swamp life. This is an aspect of the subject which specially appealed to Bartlet himself, and it should have an equally strong interest for all Free Churchmen. The revision and editing of the lectures was put by Bartlet's executors into the competent hands of Dr. C. J. Cadoux, and he has discharged a difficult task most admirably. He has also prefaced the lectures with a full biographical sketch of their author's life which will be read with the deepest interest by all who knew him and should serve to introduce him to many who did not. The whole will form a substantial volume, and the problem now is how to get it published under present war conditions. A publisher has been found but a subsidy is needed, and it may be that we shall have to make an appeal for help to some of Bartlet's friends. There must be many who will only be too glad to have some small share in producing a volume which will be a not unworthy memorial of one whom they knew and loved.

* * *

THE resignation of the Archbishop of Canterbury is deeply and universally regretted, for he has deserved well of his country and it will be hard to fill his place. Dr. Lang has been described as one of the half-dozen ablest men among us, and he has dedicated all his great powers to the service of Christ and of His Church with single-minded devotion. He has shown himself to be at once a father in God and a prince of the Church. On great occasions and from his place in the House of Lords he has never failed to give a bold and consistent Christian witness, while his sermons and addresses over the wireless have made his voice and message familiar in the homes of the people. In his relations with Free Churchmen he has always shown himself courteous, friendly, and

PACIFIC SCHOOL

sympathetic. He is resigning now that he may make way for a younger man who, he thinks, will be better able to guide the Church in the stormy days ahead and face the problems of the inevitable reconstruction. This younger man has been found in William Temple, Archbishop of York. His appointment was almost a foregone conclusion and has been universally welcomed. It is particularly acceptable to Free Churchmen, to whom Dr. Temple has always been exceedingly fair and friendly. In the dark and difficult days that lie ahead of us it is well that the leadership of the Church of England should be in the ha nds of a man so sane, so able, and so progressive.

* * *

THAT some very grave problems will confront the leaders of the churches whenever the war is over it needs no very great effort of the imagination to realize. It will not merely be a matter of restoring damaged buildings and gathering scattered congregations but, to put it quite bluntly, of making up our minds whether the new order is to be pagan or Christian. We are told that we are entering into a period "when the activities of humanity will be centrally planned". If so, it is very important to know what part, if any, the Christian Church is to play in such a centrally planned civilization. For it is obvious that the Church cannot remain aloof, "a little garden walled around" and careless of what goes on in the world outside. But that means that the Church too must do some planning and take careful thought for the future that lies ahead. The Anglican Church has begun to do this already. The findings of the now famous Malvern Conference of January, 1941, show clearly enough that many leading Anglicans are not merely dissatisfied with the present order but are prepared for very drastic changes not only in the organization of the Church but also in her impact on society as a whole. It is not surprising therefore that the findings of the Conference should have been criticized as subversive and socialistic. But its sponsors are quite unrepentant, and have now returned to the charge by publishing the various papers which introduced its discussions and on which its findings were based. They form a substantial volume entitled *Malvern 1941. The Life of the Church and the Order of Society* (Longmans, 10s. 6d.), and they are worth reading for the light they throw on certain trends of thought in at least a section of the Church of England. If some of the criticism is not as constructive as it might be, the review and summing up of the Conference by the Archbishop of York does a good deal to remedy that defect. He claims that Malvern has "put the Church on the map" and started a process of education and stimulation which must be continued among Christian people generally until a body of opinion has been formed strong enough to secure some practical results. For this

educational process the papers read at the Conference will undoubtedly be very useful.

Most of the writers of these papers are high Anglicans of a somewhat left wing tendency. They are very conscious of the need for Christianizing the new order, and some of their proposals are quite revolutionary. But they do not always remember that Christianity in the English-speaking world is not identical with the Church of England as by law established. It is true that Miss Dorothy Sayers, for example, has fitful visions of a Church Universal, embracing other communions than the Anglican, and gives a definition of a Church which is quite admirable in its breadth. She writes that a Church is "a body of men, living in the world, united in a recognizable and conscious fellowship and organized within a living tradition whose essence persists unchanged while its expressions continually develop, by a single devotion and a single service to an immanent and transcendent reality, whose claims are felt to be paramount". On the other hand, Mr. T. S. Eliot, writing on education, pleads very rightly that the task of the Church is not merely to teach religion but to Christianize the whole of education. But he also argues that the "overt secularization" of education is due to non-sectarianism. In other words, he suggests that the deliverance of Universities and schools from the domination of a single sect is the cause of their secularization. History is against him here. We are all for the Christianizing of education, but *"non tali auxilio nec defensoribus istis"*.

The Malvern Conference is a very hopeful sign of the times, but its work is only as yet beginning. It aims at nothing less than the Christianizing of a new order of society. But if that aim is to be realized it will require the united impact of all Christian forces available. It is right and natural that the Anglican Church should lead the way. But we would submit to our Anglican friends with all respect that they will need to make up their minds what they are going to do about Lambeth 1920. Are they prepared to recognize the Free Churches as real Churches, their members as true Christians, and their ministries as valid (if defective) ministries of the Word and Sacraments? If so, the way is open for much closer fellowship and co-operation, and it should be taken in hand at once. If not, then at least we know where we are. But let us make no mistake about it. In all our efforts at reconstruction we shall have to face not merely a mass of indifference but an intense hostility based on hatred of everything for which Christianity stands, its philosophy, its theology, and its ethic. To attempt to meet such an enemy with divided forces is simply to court disaster.

* * *

ANYTHING which throws light on German mentality has an interest and importance of its own. We must know all about our enemy

if we are to beat him and still more if we are to make a friend of him again. Here then are two small books which should help. One is called *The Moral Blitz*, by Bernard Causton (Secker & Warburg, 2s.), and the other *The Iron Ration of a Christian*, by Heinrich Vogel (S.C.M. Press, 6s.). They are very different, but each in its own way sheds light on the German mind and methods. Mr. Causton lived for some six years in Berlin as a newspaper correspondent, and made a special study of German propaganda and of the German reaction to the propaganda of others. He has also been in close touch with the leaders of the Confessional Churches, and makes it quite clear that they are not all martyrs or as hostile to the Nazi régime as is sometimes supposed. He writes, "The average English reader is apt to think of the Confessional Church as simply opposition to the Nazis. He probably also thinks of the Church at home as having 'failed', but if questioned why and how would probably reply, 'Because it failed to keep up with the times'. The same reproach, in fact, that the Nazis have levelled against the Confessionals. Was it simply that the Confessionals clung to their orthodoxy and so 'resisted the *pacification* of the Evangelical Church', according to the Nazi formula? The majority of German Protestants remained aloof, although with uneasy consciences in many instances, from that renewal of vital Christianity which the Nazi menace called forth in the Confessional movement. That indifference was Protestant orthodoxy, clinging to the Lutheran tradition of subservience to the State".

Pastor Vogel's book is a good example of Lutheran orthodoxy at its stiffest. So far from being an "iron ration" it is really a very full meal of Christian doctrine and practice. The writer has obviously been a good deal influenced by Karl Barth, especially in style and method of approach, but his *naïve* Biblicism and dogmatic assurance are all his own, and he is as strongly Lutheran as Barth is Calvinistic. At the same time he is quite clear that there are limits to the Lutheran subservience to the State. By all means let us obey the authority set over us, but only so far as it obeys God. "If we are presented with something against the law of God or against His will, obedience is no longer possible for us". And he goes on, "A civil power which wrests for itself the attributes of divine authority degenerates into tyranny, idolatry, and the dragooning of conscience. When it deems itself to possess final unlimited authority it not only turns law into sheer despotic power, but backs this up with a claim to divine power also. But then it destroys its true authority from within, and turns the blessing on its work into a curse". This was written some time since, and where Pastor Vogel is now or what has happened to him is not known.

W. B. S.

"It moves!" Edinburgh was a decided improvement on Lausanne, and it is encouraging to find an Anglican saying, much more effectively, what we ourselves tried to say at those Conferences. In *Into the Way of Peace* the Master of Christ's writes:

> No honest observer will doubt that the Society of Friends has a record of Christian achievement higher than that of any other denomination in Britain. If other Churches with far larger numbers and resources had done what the Friends did for the relief and reconstruction of Europe after the last war, the present calamities would almost certainly never have arisen. If other Churches cared for peace and worked for reconciliation as the Quakers have done, the scandal of warring Christians would long ago have been removed. "By their fruits ye shall know them". No one who accepts and applies that test will dare to deny that the Society of Friends is manifestly within the fellowship of the disciples, the blessed community, the Church which is the Body of Christ. Yet, if so, then the Lambeth Quadrilateral is unsound; sacraments and orders are not of the essence of the Church; the whole position needs rethinking and restatement.

These words of Canon Raven are quoted by Canon Guy Rogers in a bold article, "Reunion: Defeat or a New Offensive", in the November *Modern Churchman,* in which he argues that "intercommunion is the only key which will unlock the door into the new world of which we dreamed in 1920".

In the December issue of the *Modern Churchman* the Editor has an outspoken article entitled "Christianity and Churchianity". After saying

> The Church is not, therefore, of the very essence of the Christian Religion, and ought not to be identified with it. The Church can be, and has been on many occasions, a valuable agent and instrument of religion. It has assisted its propagation and permanence in human society, but it is not the Christian Religion itself,

he goes on, after a reference to the ministry in which he tells of the ordinand who said that the three evils from which in the Litany the Church prays to be delivered were "Bishops, priests and deacons":

> the Christian ministry is not primarily a sacramental ministry, but a preaching and teaching ministry, and the Christian Church is not essentially a sacramental Church. Moreover, an ordained ministry is not necessary for the sacraments. . . . Moreover . . . neither Baptism nor the Holy Communion are essential to the Christian Religion as taught by Jesus Christ, *although what they symbolize is essential.* There is no clear evidence that Jesus Christ instituted and commanded Baptism as a necessity for his disciples. . . .
>
> Nor can we feel assured that Jesus Christ instituted the

Eucharist as a sacramental rite to be observed by all his disciples for all time.

* * *

MR. Sidney Dark, whom nobody will accuse of harshness towards Rome, has recently written these words, which may serve as a footnote to our comments last quarter on Mr. Denis Gwynn's *The Vatican and the War in Europe*:

> Since the war began, the Church, hampered by its years of fearfulness, and, so far as Rome is concerned, compromised by its record in Spain and Italy, has utterly failed to protect its own children from Nazi brutality. Poland has always been a favoured daughter of Rome. The Pope was for years Nuncio in Warsaw, and is notoriously sympathetic to Polish aspirations. His Holiness has sternly condemned the dismemberment of Poland and the enslavement of the Poles. And Hitler is not a penny the worse. What more could the Pope have done? It is easy to guess what Hildebrand or St. Thomas of Canterbury would have done. Hitler is a nominal Roman Catholic. Surely he needed solemn excommunication. If that ghostly sentence had been inflicted, Mussolini would not have dared to drag Italy into the war, and His Holiness would have played the double parts of a patriotic Italian and a bold Christian statesman.

Incidentally Mr. Gwynn, while often referring to the growth of Roman Catholicism outside Europe, never mentions the opinion of his fellow-Catholic, Mr. William Teeling, that possibly American Roman Catholics may refuse to accept the rule of an Italian Pope.

* * *

FROM the *Christian Witness* of 1855 we take this list of the "Circulation of Weekly Religious and Secular Journals":

Athenæum	35,000
British Banner	44,000
Catholic Standard	18,000
Critic	25,000
Court Journal	8,246
Ecclesiastical Gazette	35,850
John Bull	21,424
Leader	30,000
Nonconformist	38,500
Spectator	36,000
Watchman	40,000
Wesleyan Times	32,000

A contemplation of this list and these figures is inclined to make one morbid, especially if one be a religious journalist. How few of these journals are alive today! If the strength of religion and culture is represented by the circulation of weekly journals what a lamentable history is here disclosed!

FOLLOWING Dr. Ernest Barker we set this puzzle. Whose words are these?

> We are part of what has been called the Federation of Mankind: we belong to a great community of nations, and we have no right to shrink from the duties which the community imposes on us.

No, not General Smuts nor President Wilson, nor Lord Cecil. Not even Gladstone. The words are those of Lord Salisbury, Lord Cecil's father.

And here is another. What ignorant and foolish person made this foolish and confident prophecy, and when?

> unquestionably there never was a time in the history of this country when, from the situation of Europe, we might more reasonably expect fifteen years of peace than at the present moment.

The man most likely of all to be in a position to judge correctly—William Pitt in his Budget speech of 1792.

* * *

A PROPHECY that came true. H. A. L. Fisher tells of a long talk between John Morley and Edward Grey in the autumn of 1914, at the end of which Morley delivered this parting shot:

> And, remember, Grey, that there is a little island across St. George's Channel, its wounds unstanched and its wrongs unredressed. After the war you will hear from her.

And some wide of the mark—Hort to Westcott in 1852:

> every week seems to bring us nearer to the consummation, the separation of Church and State.

And the same, in 1864:

> England and Germany, . . . the only two great nations in the world which can ever be true and intimate friends, and ultimately leaving all the civilized world a prey to the destroying Babylonish empires, France, Russia, and America.

In Prof. D. A. Binchy's *Church and State in Fascist Italy* there is a description of a dinner-party in Paris in 1875 when Renan spoke of the imminent disappearance of the Papacy as certain:

> It would come to pass, he said, in the following way: on the death of Pius IX the Conclave, under Jesuit influence, would elect a "fanatical" Pope, who would be expelled from Rome by the Italian Government. Thereupon the moderate section of the Italian Cardinals would put forward a rival claimant to the tiara, who would seek to strengthen his position by coming to terms with the Kingdom of Italy. Mutual anathemas and excommunications would follow, and in the resulting chaos the Papacy and the Catholic Church would founder and disappear.

EDITOR.

FREEDOM OF THE CHURCH IN CHRIST.

By the Rev. A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D., D.Th.

While the immediate occasion and motive of this article was the union of the National Free Church Council and the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches its content has not been determined by any one event, however interesting and important, but by the experience, study, meditation and service of half-a-century in the ministry of the one Holy Catholic Apostolic Church, the body of Christ, among the Free Churches, mainly among the Congregationalists. I have found my authoritative warrant for its content in the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, in my judgment the earliest as well as the most intensely emotional and distinctively personal of all his letters, and yet conveying Christian truth for all times and places through passionate personality. His declaration, "With freedom did Christ set us free: stand fast therefore and be not entangled again in a yoke of bondage", is addressed not to individual believers, isolated and independent, but to them in their community in the Spirit, their mutual dependence and obligation in the Church. It is the *Magna Carta,* not of individual licence, but of corporate liberty for the Church.

As it is liberty in Christ, and the new creation which results from acceptance of Him as Saviour and Lord, not only is a *right* confessed, but a *duty* imposed, and the one cannot be claimed unless the other is acknowledged. Liberty must never be divorced from responsibility. Christ's freemen are His bondslaves, the captives of His sacrificial, saving grace. It is no human privilege, but a divine prerogative in and through men, that is asserted. As the history of the Church shows, the Church has been free only as by the Spirit of Christ it has been guarded against error and sin and guided into truth and love, the distinctively and comprehensively Christian holiness. It has lapsed into bondage whenever and wherever it has been determined in principle or in practice by conformity to the as yet unredeemed world around it (*Rom.* 12[1]), to the traditions and conventions of unsaved, or only partially saved men, whether they be Fathers, or Schoolmen, or Reformers, for its enslavement may come, and has come, from within as well as without. The treatment of the subject will be not abstractly

doctrinal, but concretely historical. What are the warnings and the lessons for the present in shaping the future that come from the past?

I. When Churches in England call themselves Free, they do claim to have won a freedom which they are jealous and zealous to protect and preserve from one kind of bondage; it would be ignorant or defiant arrogance for them to claim that they had never lapsed into other forms of enslavement, more dangerous because more subtle and secret.

(1) When Jesus made the momentous declaration, described by dull expositors as an evasion, regarding the tribute to Cæsar, "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's", He recognized that as regards the matter submitted to His judgment: "Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cæsar, or not?" there was a separation of spheres, in which duties to Cæsar need not come into conflict with duties to God: and thus He corrected the current assumption of Jewish patriotism and piety, identical though distinguishable, that religion and nation were so inseparable, that a claim which patriotism resented—the subjection of the nation to an alien yoke of government—was one piety was bound to refuse. Jesus did not on this occasion go beyond the immediate issue; but His teaching about God as supreme and sovereign warrants us in adding that the separation is relative and not absolute, that God's demand may sometimes involve denial and refusal of that of Cæsar, as the apostles soon discovered in regard not at first of Roman but of Jewish authorities. Peter and John had assuredly the mind of Christ when "they answered and said: 'Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you rather than unto God judge ye, for we cannot but speak the things we saw and heard' ". The glorious company of martyrs attest the truth of this conviction.

(2) It is one of the most difficult of the tasks of the Christian conscience to determine when the relative claim of the State can be recognized and obeyed by conformity to its behests without denial and defiance of the absolute claim of God for submission to His Will, or when the two claims are so incompatible that there must be nonconformity to Cæsar in consecration to the purpose of God in Christ. A caution may be offered. So important in the interests of public order and welfare is it that the authority of the State should be maintained, if generally wisely and justly exercised, that the Christian conscience must subject to thorough scrutiny, seeking the Spirit's enlightenment, any challenge of that authority lest it be due to human wilfulness and not a call of the divine Will. It must be confessed that English Nonconformity, in its opposition to the State Church, has sometimes been unwisely

and unjustly suspicious and defiant of State authority[1]. That the separation of sphere of religion and politics, Church and State, is relative and not absolute, that there are cases where God forbids what Cæsar enjoins, and that obedience must be withheld, whatever loss or danger it may involve, is a Christian conviction, which condemns unreservedly the Lutheran dualism between the secular society, which has its own laws, due to God as Creator, and the religious community which is under grace, the Lordship of Christ as Saviour: the acquiescence of some Christian Churches in Germany in a policy inconsistent with and defiant of the Christian conscience, and the justification of it as obedience to Cæsar, gives a tragic illustration of disregard of such conviction.

(3) The Christian Church has a mission to discharge and a message to deliver in regard to which God alone has the authority to direct and control, and His sovereign Will has been revealed in the Holy Scriptures, and is being revealed in the guidance of the Holy Spirit in the measure in which the Church is obedient to His Will in dependence on His grace. In this sphere the State must be resisted and repelled as a usurper. Establishment or Endowment of the Church by the State brings it into a servitude which, however light the yoke may be made, is a restriction and deprivation of that freedom in grace which consecration to the purpose of God in Christ demands. When Church and State are partners, and the State the dominant partner, as it tends to become, the Church becomes nationalized and secularized, and loses its universality and sanctity. Without accepting the partial estimate of the Medieval Church, which ignores so many of its defects, we must confess that, since the Reformation, the tendency to divisions inherent in the unqualified claim for the freedom of private judgment in the interpretation of the Bible as the sole standard of authority has been aggravated by such nationalization, while the entanglement of the interests of the Church with those of the State has promoted its secularization. State support and control of the Church is probably seen at the best possible to it in England, and could be seen at its worst in "Holy Russia" and in Germany, where one of the reforming leaders of the Church declared that till

[1] I may be excused if I enforce my argument by two instances of my own decision on questions of conduct. Of Scottish Dissenting ancestry, I quickly assimilated on coming to England the sentiments of English Nonconformity and was a Passive Resister of the Education Act which placed the non-provided schools on the rates. I had my goods regularly distrained but I took no part in the agitation, as it seemed to me a matter for the individual conscience. I am now convinced that my action was a mistake and that the political grievance, which might be relieved by political action, was not an adequate justification. I am no conscientious objector, and the Peace Pledge Union agitation has deepened my opposition to such repudiation of citizen duty, for which my discernment at least finds no sufficient warrant either in the teaching of Jesus, or the general character of the Christian redemptive revelation. Nevertheless I respect those who follow that course and claim toleration for them, as I recognize that a real moral issue is involved.

1919 there was no Evangelical Church in Germany but parishes under the control of a government department. The Church can exercise its function of judgment of the policy of the State freely and boldly as its Christian conscience demands, only as it is not dependent upon it. It is true that leaders in the Free Churches do sometimes fail to be watchmen, warning of danger, because their sight loses its keenness, owing to their party sentiment. That the worst evils of a State Church have not emerged in England is due, I believe, to the existence alongside of the Church of England of Nonconformist denominations, influencing the Church and the State alike to prevent that excess of identification of the one with the other which must mean a degrading bondage for the Church. The Free Churches of England are therefore entirely justified in their contention that if there is to be a United Church of England it should in no way be under the direction or control of the State.

(4) This contention, however, does not mean that there shall be no national recognition of religion. Those who believe in the existence of God as Creator, Preserver, Ruler, and Redeemer, as revealed in the history of which the Holy Scriptures are the record —and a majority of our nation does—are bound to claim that in every sphere, individual, domestic, economic and political, there be rendered to Him the obedience and the worship due to Him as thus related to men. For those who doubt or deny His existence there must be toleration and charity, freedom to hold and express their contrary convictions; but it would not be wise or just that the negation of a minority should in the common life render null and void the affirmation of the majority. It is in the interests of the State itself that it should not be altogether secularized, without any outlook beyond earth and time or above man. It is a primary concern for the State that the education of youth for citizenship should not be secular, but that with all knowledge of the world and man, nature and history, there should be imparted the wisdom from above, that can most effectively purify and elevate human thought and life. The functions of the State are necessarily, as the structure of society increases the mutual dependence of its members, being expanded from the protection of outward goods to the promotion of inward values, cultural, moral, social; and as these can be best promoted only as they are always related to the Highest Value, the source of all values, God Himself, the Church must be prepared for an increasing co-operation with the State to promote the common interests in these values. In that co-operation it must always be on its guard to preserve its freedom in Christ, and not to be entangled in a yoke of bondage; and it should be concerned not only to protect its own freedom, but also that of those other inward values, of the attainment of which personal freedom is a condition, to which any direction or control by the

State beyond what is absolutely necessary for their promotions tends to become a hindrance. Totalitarianism in Germany and Italy may be regarded as the *reductio ad absurdum* of this expanding function of the State unless kept within its proper bounds by the recognition of, and respect for, the sacredness of human personality and the liberty without which it cannot realize its highest and utmost, and of that freedom the Church must always be a jealous and zealous guardian.

II. There is a danger to freedom within as well as without the Church: (1) A church might be free of any State direction or control, and yet enslaved in its own organization as regards creed, ritual, polity: its life might be endangered by the grip of the "dead hand", the traditions and conventions of its own past. As the Free Churches are convinced that the acceptance in principle and in practice of the theory of the Apostolic Succession in the Historic Episcopate involves that peril, they have made it clear in all the conversations which their representatives have had with representatives of the Church of England that not only could they not assent to any explicit acceptance of the theory, but would even object to any conditions of membership or ministry in the United Church which could be justified only by an implicit application of the theory.

(2) While no Free Churchman would be justified in requiring the repudiations of the theory by any Anglican who holds it, Free Churchmen could not be expected to accept a polity of which the theory was the guiding principle for the following reasons: (a) It is only by an ingenuity of interpretation, which one might call perverse if it were not so sincere, that the authority of the New Testament can be claimed for it. Most scholars, Anglican as well as Free Church, admit that the New Testament cannot be so claimed for any theory. One exponent of it has to begin with the Fathers of the Second Century, and to read the New Testament through their eyes, although it is generally conceded that these Fathers had, from the height of Christian thought and life to which the New Testament writers rise, lapsed nearer to the level of their own time in the world around. Another exponent has to appeal to the legislation of the Old Testament as a precedent for similar legislation in the New, thus ignoring the teaching of Paul in regard to the freedom of the Church from the Jewish law and indeed all legalism. (b) How far Jesus shared the current ardent expectation of the first generation of believers in the Second Advent of the Lord in power and glory is uncertain, but what is certain is that the writings of the New Testament betray no evidence of possession by the Church of an organization to be permanent in coming centuries. Neither Jesus nor His apostles had any interest in such a

provision for a long future, which they, if not He, did not anticipate. (c) Such organization as was adopted only under the pressure of events and necessities thereby disclosed was adapted to the existing conditions and environments, Jewish or Gentile, and as these have ceased and others supervened they have necessarily become antiquated. (d) The most compelling reason, however, is that the Spirit was given to the Church to lead into truths which Jesus in His lifetime had not been able to impart to His disciples, and He who ever liveth through that same Spirit is guiding and guarding the Church, His body, in what we are warranted in regarding as a progressive development in the spread of His Gospel and the growth of the Kingdom of God. It is the promise of Christ to be in the midst where two or three of His disciples are gathered together in His Name and to be present "all the days to the consummation of the age" (*Mt.* 28^{20}, R.V. marg.), fulfilled so certainly and abundantly in the experience of the Church, and it is the gift of the Spirit of God by whom His presence is realized, that affords the warrant for the claim to freedom from all entanglements with the traditions and conventions of the past to follow the leading and obey the rule of the present Lord in His Spirit: and in that freedom the Free Churches, whatever changes may come, should be resolved and resolute to stand fast, as Paul enjoins. An ever-changing world needs a Church free in Christ and His Spirit so to change its organization as to make itself more effective for its unchanging functions.

III. There is, it must be added, a danger nearer home; the Free Churches may allow themselves to be enslaved to their own past. Calvin was a great reformer, less attractive as a man but more comprehensive and effective as a thinker than Luther, and he has still much to teach us in restraint of the laxity and even licence in thought and life into which liberty is prone to lapse when unguided and unguarded by the Holy Spirit of Truth, in recalling to us the sovereignty of God, not as inscrutable Will, as he taught, but as the Holy Father Whom the grace of Christ reveals. But the Neo-Calvinism which in some of its younger exponents is becoming an intolerant obsession must not be allowed to rob us of the gains which our more modern methods of dealing with the Holy Scriptures have taught us. Wesley was a great evangelist, a scholar, and a saint; but his theology must not be so identified with the Gospel as to forbid fresh insights and presentations, nor must his organization, effective as it was, be regarded as an obligation everywhere and always. Some of my Congregational brethren are frequently appealing to the Early Separatists as our spiritual ancestors, and desire us to keep walking in the way of those fathers—Independency, the autonomy of each congregation, must

be maintained at any cost and asserted whenever wider co-operation is proposed. For such antiquarianisms in theory and anachronism in practice I have no use, and offer no plea. The only Congregational principle that I tenaciously hold is based not on any single text, but on the conception of the Church found in the New Testament, which corresponds with the conception of God. As God is not extended in space or continued in time, but is in His eternal infinite reality in every place and time in all His fullness, so is the Risen Christ in Whom God is reconciling the world unto Himself unconfined by the limitations of His earthly life, and so is the Church, the community of believers as His body, the organ of His activity, present as a whole in every part; accordingly the local congregation is the manifestation in that place of the universal Church, as Christ is confessed Saviour and Lord, and the leading of His Spirit is sought and found. That conviction carries with it the practical application that in so far as the local congregation has the ability and the opportunity it should be as free of all outside restraints to fulfil its essential functions of witness, worship, and service under Christ's Lordship and the Spirit's leading. That does not mean Independency as isolation from, or indifference to, other congregations, but such an abiding in the one whole Church as will give to all other parts their proper place of interest, affection, and co-operation as living membership in this one Body demands. I am prepared to accept Episcopacy and Presbyterianism as directive conceptions in the formation of the polity of the United Church of England. I am prepared in—what seems more practicable at present—the United Free Church to welcome whatever in Methodism or Presbyterianism has proved its permanent value, but not what is prized only because it has come down from the past. I cannot myself see why infant baptism and believers' baptism, as complementary aspects in symbol of varied Christian life, might not be practised, as conviction required. I even wish and hope that in some way the membership in the Church might be recognized of those believers who for conscience' sake refrain from the use of the sacraments, mistaken though I believe them to be. But I do emphasize the Congregational principle that the local congregation shall be accorded the largest possible liberty in Christ by His Spirit consistent with fervent loyalty and devoted service to the Church in all its parts. Uniformity suppresses liberty, liberty alone can secure variety-in-unity and thus the fullness in the oneness of the life in God.

"UNOFFICIAL VISITORS."

By Muriel Kent.

"I am going to visit the prisoner".—*Measure for Measure* III. 2.

I. In the last few years so many accounts of prison life, written by ex-prisoners, have been published that the fact of having served a sentence almost appears as a passport to the favour of certain editors and publishers. Their number certainly implies widespread interest in the subject among the general public. But one man's experience of, and reaction to, a term of imprisonment can never give the most reliable evidence on its actual conditions. The natural inclination to bring a strong countercharge at the first opportunity, to assert the ego which has been under rigorous suppression, must be reckoned with. It should also be remembered that prison authorities, from the Commissioners down to the officers who are responsible for police duties within the walls, are civil servants who cannot defend themselves against accusations, even if these are false, or so framed as to mislead all but the judicial.

An educated man, deprived of all that made up his normal life, may regard every loss as society's crude revenge for his offence. Or he may be moved by a genuine conviction of the futility of prison regulations to arraign the whole system and personnel. Either view is likely to produce only a partial version of the facts.

Those who wish to discover how far penal reform has already advanced, and what are the administrators' aims for the future, must study the latest Reports of H.M. Prison Commissioners. And a brief survey of modern penology, set against its historical background, may be found in a recent book written by an expert[1]. As a magistrate, a prison visitor, and a humanist, the author holds this faith:

> Important as the right treatment of the prisoner may be, it is as nothing to the importance of social service in the ordinary walks of life, that the need to imprison may not arise.

Even those familiar with the achievements of John Howard and Elizabeth Fry may find fresh aspects of their work pointed out in Mr. Watson's chapter, "The Pioneers". He also tells the story of another reformer, Sarah Martin, whose heroic mission was scarcely recognized outside her native county which, apparently, she never left.

She was born in 1791, eleven years later than Mrs. Fry, and in very different circumstances; the only child of a small tradesman

[1] John A. F. Watson, *Meet the Prisoner*, 233. Cape. 1939.

in the village of Caister, near Yarmouth. After his death she was brought up by her grandmother, and began at an early age to earn her own living by dressmaking. Though her education must have been slight, she had an exceedingly active mind and was a great reader. At the age of nineteen she was deeply impressed by a Nonconformist meeting which she attended in Yarmouth; and from that time she devoted all her spare time to the most miserable and degraded of her neighbours.

Her first venture was among the inmates of the local workhouse, where conditions were deplorable. She started Bible readings and held classes for the children; she also gave them a treat four times a year, "paid for out of her own scanty savings". It was only after several refusals that her wish to visit the prisoners in Yarmouth Gaol was granted—and then she found the state of the buildings, and of the men and women confined there, so dreadful that she dared not describe it to her friends. But she became a regular visitor in that dark place, where "all prisoners of every degree, tried and untried, were massed together", and never failed to hold two services in the gaol every Sunday.

The report made by the Prison Inspector of the northern district of Great Britain for 1835[2] contained a condemnation of the gaol at Yarmouth which is relieved only by the full account of Sarah Martin's work among the unfortunate prisoners. Her genius for practical organization could only be applied individually in such conditions. But for seventeen years she had taught and influenced successive inmates; and, at the same time, had acted as "nothing less than an unofficial discharged prisoners' aid society". By her constant efforts she contrived to raise a fund to provide materials for the handicrafts they learned in gaol, to find employment for them on leaving, and to follow them with her care and sympathy in after years.

She even kept a series of notebooks, on the lines of what is now called "case work", in which she recorded particulars of each prisoner visited by her, and the form of help given on release; also exact entries of all donations and expenditure for training and equipment.

Those notebooks are still to be seen at Yarmouth, in the library over the municipal museum, which is now housed in part of the old prison buildings. There, too, the four underground cells—referred to by the Inspector as "unfit for the confinement of any human being"—are shown; and Sarah Martin's memory may be duly honoured on the very scene of her labours, which were so exacting to body and spirit that she died worn out when only fifty-one.

It is noteworthy that Elizabeth Fry and Sarah Martin, the contemporary originators of prison visiting, belonged to the same

[2] Quoted in *Meet the Prisoner*, 37, 38.

English county, though probably quite unknown to each other. And one of the most successful schemes of preventive work being carried on to-day is through the Boys' Clubs at Norwich, which are organized and managed by the Police force of the city.

II. Perhaps the forerunners, in the early nineteenth century, prepared the way for another reformer of lives rather than systems, Mathilda Wrede[3], the Finnish lady whose lifework, in our own times, gained for her the title of "Friend of Prisoners". Her father, Baron Wrede, was "a cultured, high-minded and noble-hearted man", and his position as Governor of the province gave her certain initial advantages when, in response to a vision, she dedicated all her powers to an ever-growing task. She applied for, and obtained, a permit to visit every prison in Finland, with the definite purpose of giving spiritual help to the inmates.

> In this field she laboured ceaselessly for more than thirty years. For weeks at a time, from 7.30 a.m. to 6.30 p.m., with a break for dinner, she would stay within the prison walls, going from cell to cell, bringing to the shut-in something of beauty, nobility and freedom from her wider horizons, seeking with infinite pity, respect, patience, resource, humour and devotion for some point of contact. . . . Three times she accompanied to the frontier prisoners exiled to Siberia — a heartrending experience. . . . It was a life of intense strain and continuous self-denial. Yet that was not how it seemed to her, looking back at the close. "Has anyone ever had so rich a life as I?" were almost her last words[4].

Out of that hidden, personal relationship, came her deep interest in the cause of international penal reform; her concern for the prisoners' families during the term of imprisonment; and the various ways by which she sought to teach discharged men "just what those intractable natures found hardest—order, discipline, and regular work". Her calm bearing and manifest goodwill never failed to impress the most violent or desperate criminal, saving her repeatedly from danger, and bringing about many miracles of reconciliation.

Each of those great succourers of prisoners was a spiritual genius; and, at the same time, untiring in their efforts for the whole man or woman. Stephen Grellet, the Quaker mystic, belonged to the same category, though his share is often forgotten by social historians. It was he who, on his first visit to England, felt constrained to enter Newgate; and when he discovered the horrors of the wards where the women and children were herded, it was his appeal that sent Elizabeth Fry to their rescue.

[3] 1864-1928. A biography of Fröken Wrede, written by her friend, Lilian Stevenson, was published by Allen & Unwin in 1925.

[4] From a memorial article by Lilian Stevenson, in *The Howard Journal*, September, 1930.

III. Mr. Watson reminds us that after Mrs. Fry's death in 1843, there was an interval of fifty years before voluntary service in prisons was re-established on an organized plan. Meanwhile, imprisonment had changed its character though not its name. We are so accustomed to the idea of this form of punishment for evil-doers that a statement of its modern development is useful.

> Up to comparatively recent times so-called *prisons* were not used for the ordinary run of offenders but for political or religious violators or for debtors. At the beginning of the eighteenth century imprisonment as a common punishment for crime was unusual; by the middle of the nineteenth century it had become the accepted practice of European countries and the United States[5].

In England that transition was made by degrees; from strongholds farmed out to profiteering gaolers, and haunts of iniquity, to prisons which were in general under the control of the justices. Throughout the nineteenth century there were repeated attempts, by individuals and in Parliament, to reshape the whole penal system—attempts that were sometimes based on wrong theory, and proving harmful in practice, yet showing that the earlier propagandists had indeed stirred the country's conscience.

Not till 1877 did the State take over the entire responsibility for penal administration from the local authorities. Twenty years before, the abominable hulks had been crowded with convicts; and transportation was abolished only in 1869. A long stage of rigid officialism followed, for the newly-appointed Prison Commissioners made uniformity of prison discipline their chief objective. To this end the separate or "cell" system, with the deadly monotony of unproductive labour, was enforced everywhere. Outwardly, the regulations were effectual. Order, health and decency were no longer disregarded; many prisons were closed, and there was a steady decrease in the number of prisoners received. Only those who observed the rising tide of recidivism realized that undiscriminating severity had failed to reform or to deter a large proportion of offenders who had spent months or years in confinement. It was also apparent that the prisoners' mental capacity became lower under a rule which deprived them of every incentive.

The investigations of the Gladstone Committee (1894) led to another Prison Act—of great importance because it was based on a new principle—four years later. With the appointment of Sir Evelyn Ruggles-Brise as Chairman of the Commissioners, an era of rational and enduring progress set in. From that time onwards, as Mr. Watson claims, they, and their later successors, have "laboured so to remodel the English prison system that the reforma-

[5] Fred. E. Haynes, *The American Prison System.* McGraw-Hill. 1939.

tion of the offender might rank as one of its *first* objects instead of the last".

IV. Since the war years, which delayed all normal social movements, there has been a marked speeding up of measures and methods in penal matters. Education in English prisons, as a regular undertaking, belongs to the 'twenties; though the impressive list of "Educational Advisers to Governors" in the Annual Reports does not suggest how lately, and almost casually, the scheme began. The story of the earliest experiment carried out at Wormwood Scrubbs, told by its leader, Mr. Charles Douie, is one of the most fascinating chapters in his book *Beyond the Sunset*[6]. At that time (1922), classification of prisoners—which is still hindered by financial restriction and unsuitable buildings—was far more imperfect, and Wormwood Scrubbs was used as an ordinary local prison for men:

> These were of every age and type, ranging from boys in their twenties to old lags who had been inside a dozen times. Educationally they were equally varied and it was no uncommon experience to find an ex-public schoolboy and an illiterate tramp occupying adjacent cells[7].

Mr. Watson himself joined the three other voluntary teachers some months later. It was his first introduction to the strange world within prison walls; and he gives a vivid account of the extraordinary difficulties which had to be overcome by the little band in making their ill-assorted pupils into any kind of "class". But that gallant effort to bring the tonic of learning to vacant or brooding minds has been richly rewarded; it opened the way to the larger schemes of adult education now organized in all convict and local prisons.

The teachers are still volunteers (including some qualified officers who help in special subjects), often giving up their free evening hours to hold prison classes. Technical subjects have been added to the curriculum; and, more recently, courses of instruction were started at Maidstone "star" prison—*i.e.*, for young convicts —which have enabled a number of the more educated men to sit for the examinations of the Royal Society of Arts and Pitman's shorthand tests, with satisfactory results. Classes were held in book-keeping, first aid, music, horticulture, building construction, gymnastics, languages, and other subjects[8].

By a new scheme, a small number of men from Maidstone have been transferred to Wakefield for a part of their sentence. The Governor's notes on the effect of this change, to another and hope-

[6] John Murray, 1935.
[7] *Meet the Prisoner*, 132.
[8] *Prison Commissioners' Annual Report*, 1937, 68.

ful atmosphere, are very significant of the constructive spirit which is usually found in the senior officers nowadays.

> The improvement physically, but—far more important—in their general outlook on things, and the gradual losing of the dull, sullen and often rebellious manner that many have come here with, is really most marked. . . . This is no adverse comment on the officials at Maidstone—but it is on the system still existing. One must realise that you cannot expect normally decent men—put for 12 to 15 years behind a wall—to do other than lose heart. The initial upheaval—out of the miserable rut they get into—must be faced. Not a man of those already come from Maidstone wanted to be so transferred—none now want to go back[9].

Wakefield may be called the pioneer of English reformed prisons. There one experiment after another has been tried out, and extended later, wholly or in part, to other prisons. The authorities are also responsible for a successful farm camp, seven miles from the city, where about eighty selected men live and work, under the guardianship of a housemaster and four officers.

These open-air prisoners are all in their third "stage", with good records for behaviour, and have already passed the longer part of their sentence in Wakefield. They are employed in clearing and agricultural labour of a strenuous kind for ten hours daily; after that is over, the community life is free—"within the wide limits of four white-banded trees"—and friendly. The experiment began five years ago with parties of men going out from Wakefield to New Hall Camp for working days, returning to the prison for week-ends. Huts for all living purposes have since been built, and the residents remain at the camp until two days before their discharge.

The Governor is able to report that a very wholesome tone prevails; that no breaches of discipline have occurred; and that not a single man has had to be returned to the prison during the experimental years. He has discovered in these convicted lawbreakers such virtues as "friendliness, courage, a sense of responsibility, sportsmanship, honesty, chivalry", and they are treated frankly and fairly as grown men who are to be restored to the status of citizens.

Dartmoor, as the prison for recidivist convicts, has to deal with harder problems. But there, too, progress is shown by the reorganization and improvement of workshops, and by increased physical and educational privileges. The library has been greatly enlarged, and, in spite of comparative inaccessibility, the prison is not without visiting teachers.

The various classes still maintain their popularity, perhaps

[9] *Annual Report*, 82.

> the most popular being French, taken by a master from the Tavistock Grammar School, and General Knowledge taken by the Chaplain. In all there are about 160 men attending one class or another. All classes are voluntary, and invariably mean the giving up of an hour's association, so that attendance is no idle whim. The physical training class meets twice a week, and is much appreciated by the fit and younger men who are eligible to attend[10].

At Parkhurst (another recidivist prison, which also includes a hospital for convicts in ill-health or mentally unstable), correspondence courses have recently been started with the help of the National Adult School Union. Though only a few men ventured on these at first, their interest, and the number of courses undertaken, are increasing. Music is leading favourite among the subjects; after that the most popular are literature, economics, Esperanto, geography, ethics and philosophy, and Bible study.

V. The development of prison libraries, an integral part of the educational movement, has gone forward immensely in the last twenty years. It owed much to grants made, for a period, by the Carnegie Trust for the purchase of textbooks and manuals which could not be covered by the Government's ordinary budget. In most prisons a good general collection of books now exists, and is replenished by frequent gifts. The method of distribution, too, has been reorganized in the larger prisons; librarians are appointed to undertake this work, and catalogues have been compiled. The Maidstone library contains over 15,000 books; each prisoner is allowed to exchange three weekly, and men who have reached the "special" stage (over four years of their sentence) are privileged to visit the library to choose their own books at week-ends. The Chaplain adds:

> A fair number of approved periodicals are sent in, and these do not lack readers. Thanks to these, to the King-Hall News Letter, our own weekly news sheet, etc., one can safely say that the average man in here is rather better informed on national and international affairs than he was outside[11].

The anonymous author of *Five Years for Fraud*[12], a professional man, held for some months the coveted post of librarian, with its "red band" of privilege, enabling him to move freely about the prison buildings at Shrewsbury. After he was transferred to Maidstone he was again lucky enough to be put in charge of the prisoners' books, and his memoirs give some interesting information about their choice of reading. From his considerable experience,

[10] *Ibid.*, 56.

[11] *Ibid.*, 69. Perhaps we may add that at one time it was reported to us from Maidstone that there were eager readers of the *Congregational Quarterly*. [EDITOR.]

[12] Sampson Low, 1936.

he puts the order of popularity thus: 1 "Thrillers", 2 Biographies, 3 Good novels, 4 Travels. But the Commissioners have now created the position of "Librarian Officer" in prisons—often filled by one who has had special training in a public library—for the greater efficiency of the service. Wakefield prison, as the chief educational centre, and also accommodating the new Training School for Officers, has its own technical and foreign libraries, from which the other establishments are able to draw according to their needs. County and local authorities, too, are generous in supplying the latest handbooks to technical students in prisons.

VI. There remains a proportion—larger than one expects—of prisoners who cannot benefit through the agencies of books and classes. Out of 31,266 convicted prisoners in 1937 (this total includes England, Wales, Scotland, Ireland, other parts of H.M. Dominions, and foreign countries), 699 men and 206 women were illiterate. A larger number could only read and write imperfectly; the great majority had attained "moderate proficiency in reading and writing". Those able to do both well numbered 1,406, reckoning men and women together; and 61 men were described as of "superior education".

The unlearned prisoner, if serving a long sentence, may be in even greater need of "unofficial visitors" than the intelligent reader and scholar. The hours between 5.30 and 9 p.m., when lights are put out, are spent in the cells by all first stage prisoners—and those sentenced for less than three months never reach any other. During the second stage, of at least six months, privileges are increased, *i.e.*, another book weekly, letters and visits from relations at shorter intervals; the right to attend certain classes and lectures, and to earn by prison labour, where the earning scheme has been already adopted. Prisoners in the third stage are eligible for the maximum of educational and recreational opportunities; smoking is allowed at certain hours, and in some prisons meals are taken in association.

In this country, and in the States, it is often said that reformed prisons are "too comfortable" to be either punitive or deterrent in their effect. That is not the impression received by investigators who study the whole field of penology; nor by prison visitors who see the conditions for themselves, and learn to know men and women under sentence. They at least are able to estimate whether changed methods in these matters—the substitution of discipline and training for the old plan of caging and repression—are wise as well as humane.

"Lady Visitors" had been at work in women's prisons for about thirty years before the Commissioners took the next step and introduced men visitors to men prisoners (1922). But this daring

innovation, as it was accounted, soon justified itself, and has grown into the National Association of Prison Visitors, a large body of workers who are voluntary and unofficial—thus distinguished from the visiting justices—yet authorized and appointed by the Commissioners. A booklet of advice and regulations is issued to all visitors and teachers, defining the kind of service they can render, and at the same time, summing up the aims of the modern English prison system[13].

I do not know if such an Association, and its complementary one of Prison Visitors to Women, is peculiar to this country. Certainly their purpose is akin to that which underlies the "sponsorship" plan in the State Prison Colony at Norfolk, Massachusetts, described by Mr. Haynes in his survey of American prisons[14]. He is in full and frank sympathy with the reformers; convinced that the old penology has failed utterly, and that only those States which are now experimenting, in a new spirit and on very different lines, have begun to solve the vast, complex problem of criminality in America.

The collective influence of the friends in need who form our English Associations must be very great, and the authorities take care that it is not dissipated. Prisoners with very short sentences are not visited, because they could gain little benefit from a few interviews. A reception board within the prison makes a list of the longer term prisoners who "will be likely to profit by this kind of help". Visitors are reminded that their special work is closely linked with that of the Prisoners' Aid Societies, which are represented by a committee in every prison and exist to re-establish discharged prisoners in the outside world. The knowledge gained, by regular, repeated visits, "of the character, wishes, circumstances and prospects of prisoners while serving their sentences, is invaluable to the Societies" when the time comes to give practical help.

As the Honorary Secretary of the N.A.P.V. for ten years, Mr. Watson was often consulted by newly appointed visitors as to the best way of approaching the prisoners allotted to their care. This preliminary of fitting the one group to the other demands much consideration; for diversity is equally marked in both. Like the prisoners themselves, the visitors are drawn from every class and occupation.

> But whether the prison visitor graduated in the Board School or at Balliol, there are certain qualities he *must* possess —breadth of outlook, sympathy and, above all, a sense of humour. He should not be too young; most certainly he must not be too old. He must have a hard head—which is quite unrelated to a hard heart—and be devoid of all false sentiment or morbidity. Preferably he is a man who leads an active life

[13] *Meet the Prisoner*, 100. [14] *The American Prison System*, 71.

outside the prison, and is in close touch daily with social and industrial conditions[15].

With all his experience, Mr. Watson offers no formula in answer to the question often put to him: "When I enter a man's cell for the first time how do you advise me to begin?" But he does suggest that the behaviour of ordinary intercourse—a self-introduction, a handshake, and the manner of one "visiting a friend, not observing a case"—is the quickest way to overcome any natural doubt or antagonism in the prisoner's mind. The visitor is already provided with a book containing the names of eight or ten prisoners, the cell number of each, also the nature of his offence and the length of his sentence. That is necessary for reference, but the tactful visitor displays no notebook, and avoids all appearance of curiosity about the prisoner's private affairs until his confidence has been won.

Religion, Mr. Watson declares,

> is the strongest force which can be enlisted in the work of reclaiming the offender. No prison administration which sets out to achieve that end can afford to ignore or belittle its power.

And, apart from this faith, it is unlikely that volunteers would be found for a form of social service that is always difficult, and often discouraging. But prison visitors are not intended to act as the Chaplain's substitutes; it is by their whole attitude to men and women under punishment that they may be his indirect allies.

At first they must be content to feel their way, to discover a point of contact with each prisoner, so that at least one subject will be discussed with real interest. The visitor is at liberty to give the news of the day, without political bias; and some skill and practice are required so to "edit" it that the few who are eager to hear about national and international affairs may be satisfied; and the majority supplied with more familiar matter. Here, too, Mr. Watson is explicit:

> The visitor should look upon it as part of his job to know enough about the principal forms of sport to discuss any of them with reasonable intelligence. . . . Conversation on any topic is justified if it helps to lift the prisoner out of himself, and enables his visitor to get to know him[16].

Prisoners who are eligible for evening classes will consult their visitors about the various courses. Those of less mental ability are glad to be guided in choosing books from the library—with the result that many gain the reading habit, and a taste for literature of a different order from a Sunday newspaper or a cheap "shocker".

[15] Pp. 101-2. [16] P. 109.

The subject of after-care can only be glanced at here. But prison visitors know that the crucial time begins when the prisoner is discharged. Then, more than ever, if he is to be kept from despair, if the first offender is to be saved from becoming an old lag, he needs persistent friendship. And, generally speaking, his desire to make good will be ineffective unless he has the support of an "appointed society" with a co-ordinated scheme of help and supervision, such as that evolved at Wakefield; or unless the methods of the Central Association for Convicts, which is a semi-official body, presided over by the Home Secretary, can be extended and adapted to the needs of local prisoners also.

SACRAMENTAL PRACTICE AND DOCTRINE

By A Nonconformist Minister.

It is widely felt today that there is a weakness in the ritual side of Free Church worship, and a void that, in view of the attraction of much Anglican worship for those who are sensitive to beauty, needs urgently to be filled if Nonconformity is not to be devoid of æsthetic appeal. Hence the interest in sacramental practice which has become increasingly apparent.

Greater emphasis upon the Lord's Supper is surely to be welcomed, and few will maintain that Communion, however frequent, can do harm. On the contrary, it is one of the most obvious and fruitful ways of enriching the Church's life and removing the stigma of ritual sterility which is so often attached to our worship. Nevertheless, sacramental revivals find not a few opponents, because it is feared they indicate a return to obscurantism, if not to Rome. The fact is that there is a more profound danger abroad than mere excess of sacramental devotion.

Heresy is usually the exaggeration of a neglected truth; but we have to be on our guard not only against distortion of certain tenets of evangelical religion, but also against the introduction of forms that imply a radically different religion and cannot square with an enlightened faith. We shall not be doing a disservice to any party if we enquire into the theological implications of ritual practices.

First of all, we should note the intimate relationship between the conception we may hold of the nature of the Lord's Supper and the theory of the Atonement which it presupposes. There is a vital connexion between the two, at least historically, which is often neglected in councils on Church union, to the subsequent confusion of members of such bodies. It is not unnatural that Roman and Anglo-Catholics should hold the penal or Latin theory of the Atonement, for this provides the necessary justification for the sacrifice of the Mass, hence its speedy adoption once it had been formulated:

> The Latin doctrine of the Atonement was completely in accord with the general nature of medieval theology, with its typical emphasis on penance and on the Sacrifice of the Mass. The doctrine of penance emphasized the necessity of satisfaction, and the Mass was interpreted primarily as a sacrifice for sins[1].

Since, therefore, the doctrine of the Eucharist is at stake in some

[1] Aulén, *Christus Victor*, 111.

Atonement theories, it is hardly unfair to say that, in general, when Anglo-Catholics treat of the Atonement they are fatally, though perhaps unconsciously, biased from the outset. Naturally, then, the work that has been done during the last hundred years to show that the death of Christ was not a penal sacrifice—perhaps the greatest doctrinal gain since the Reformation—has been accomplished by independent scholars and evangelicals.

It is an observed fact that modern sacramentalists, seeking justification for a "higher" view of the Eucharist, have returned to older Atonement theories. Thus we have reactions from what are loosely termed "subjective" conceptions of Christ's work in favour of beliefs in a vicarious penance or substitutionary sacrifice offered up by Jesus. It would be interesting to conjecture how far these reactions derive their inspiration from a feeling that there is "something more" in the Eucharist, and therefore there must be also "something more" in the Atonement. Some illustration may be provided by Dr. Vincent Taylor's *Jesus and His Sacrifice*[2]:

> In the first place, the self-offering of Jesus is His perfect obedience to the Father's will. The obedience is His own, but since He presents it as the Son of Man, it is also representative obedience. . . Secondly, the self-offering of Jesus is His perfect submission to the judgement of God upon sin. . . . What is needed is the vision of a perfect submission with which man may identify himself. No offer of penal suffering as a substitute for his own will meet his need, but a submission presented by his Representative before God becomes the foundation of a new hope. . . . Thirdly, the self-offering of Jesus is the expression of His perfect penitence for the sins of men.

This is worked into a brief summary of the communal aspect of the Eucharist, where it is declared that at the Supper the communicant

> approaches God, conscious not only of personal sins, but also of the sins of the world, its blindness, cruelty, and hardness of heart. In this sin he is enmeshed, whatever his individual contribution may be, because he is a child of man, a member of a sinful community,

and here

> the Amen of his spirit to Christ's offering of obedience, submission, and penitence, attains its deepest intensity. In this way the Eucharist offers its supreme opportunity for participation in the Sacrifice of Christ[3].

Although the closing statements are vague and are not intended to provide a complete rationale of the sacrament, yet one feels that it would not be going much farther to suggest that one is united with the sacrifice of Christ only supremely when the sacrament is per-

[2] Pp. 307-9. [3] Pp. 323-4.

formed. We cannot here go into the questionable notions of penal suffering or perfect penitence; it has often seemed to me that, by the orthodox Christology, such notions divide the Unity of the Godhead, and really imply a purely human view of Jesus, which is far from what its exponents desire. But the whole notion of sacrifice needs to be carefully handled if it is to be used at all in connexion with an evangelical communion; and the belief in eternal intercession with which Dr. Taylor closes, whatever its justification in *Hebrews*, is full of difficulties. Finally, since the Eucharist is not the most frequent rite of Free Church worship, and since it is difficult to see how it ever can be with the present systems of organization in force in many Churches—and notably in Dr. Taylor's—we may question whether the Eucharist can "stand at the centre" or can give us our supreme opportunity of communion with God. The preaching of the Word is, at least, as important a means of grace, and communion with Christ's spirit may often be found as much through prayer as through the ritual of the Supper. We are reminded of the words of G. A. Johnston Ross:

> Before you go further with your sacramentarianism, ask an answer to this question: What does the Sacrament do for you that prayer does not do, except the same thing more vividly? I think there's a lot of humbug spoken about the *Real* Presence. I believe in Christ's real presence in the sacramental act, because I believe in His presence in every spiritual transaction; but what is this *Real* Presence? "Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them"—*I*: do you mean that that "I" is less real than the "I" in the Sacrament? The thing is nonsense and hasn't an atom of biblical support.

So that we may see that once there is provided doctrinal foundation for notions of divine satisfaction and celestial intercession, you have not only denied God's unmerited grace, but you have prepared the entrance for sacramental practices that will lead dangerously near to Rome. Reactionary Atonement theories are not only subversive of evangelical doctrine in general, but also of eucharistic practice in particular.

In D. H. Hislop's book, *Our Heritage in Public Worship*, we have the somewhat surprising spectacle of a Presbyterian minister and a "Kerr Lecturer" calling[4] the Roman Mass "the most moving rite and noblest liturgy in Christendom", which "illustrates a vital type of worship whose essential traits must belong to the ideal liturgy of the universal and catholic Church". Now although, as a spectacle, the Roman Mass can be beautiful, and doubtless is a moving rite to those who accept its fundamental

[4] Pp. 137 and 149.

presuppositions, yet Nonconformists, at least, usually attach as much importance to the doctrinal validity as to the emotional influence of any rite. If we are to find a place within the fold of the universal Church, not as merely repenting of our errors but as contributing something of our own which has lasting value, we must see a radical revision of some of the basic beliefs of even the most moving rites. To ask for less would be to commit the old heresy of "art for art's sake". Although Mr. Hislop does give some criticisms[5] of the Mass ("the Missal has not escaped criticism or at least tentative suggestion for improvement"), yet the radical doctrinal objections that we might have expected are not to be found amongst them. We trust that Presbyterian scholars as a whole would not be guilty of a similar omission.

Another illustration of current tendencies divorcing practice from doctrine may be seen in the revival in some Methodist circles of the Wesleyan early emphasis upon frequent attendance at Communion, and the re-vitalizing of such eucharistic doctrine as can be extracted from the sacred books of Methodism. The Wesleys were not always consistent; Charles, in particular, combined in an extraordinary fashion the most absolute assertions of God's free grace with unscriptural and self-contradictory phrases such as "my God is reconciled" and "He purchased the grace". Neither were the Wesleys great constructive thinkers; so that to adopt their "theology" means, generally, taking over the theories of some 17th or 18th century Anglican. There has recently been reprinted by the Methodist Sacramental Fellowship a selection from Wesley's Hymns on the Lord's Supper. In this little work the most important part is the preface, "The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice", extracted from Dr. Brevint, a Dean of Lincoln (d. 1695). Brevint says that

> we every day offer unto God the meritorious sufferings of our Lord, as the only sure ground whereon God may give, and we obtain, the blessings we pray for.

And the communion table

> is an Altar whereon men mystically present to God the same sacrifice as still bleeding and suing for mercy.

Charles Wesley has turned much of Brevint into verse, and the same thought appears later on in the book:

> O Thou, eternal Victim, slain
> A Sacrifice for guilty man,
> By the eternal Spirit made
> An Offering in the sinner's stead:
> Our everlasting Priest art Thou,
> And plead'st Thy death for sinners now.

[5] Pp. 135-7.

Thy Offering still continues new;
Thy vesture keeps its bloody hue;
Thou stand'st the ever slaughtered Lamb;
Thy Priesthood still remains the same.

It may be noted that this hymn has been entirely omitted from the new Methodist Hymn Book of 1933. It is a pity that those who think it is worth reviving have thrown over all the labours of Protestant scholars who since Wesley's day have tried to show that the death of Christ is the supreme revelation of God's grace, and is not a means of coercing or satisfying God. "The only sure ground whereon God may give" our blessings, forsooth! We do not seem to be too far from the canon of the Mass:

> Accept, O Holy Father, this unspotted Host, which I, thine unworthy servant, offer unto thee, for my innumerable sins, offences, and negligences, and for all standing round . . . that it may avail both me and them for salvation unto everlasting life.
>
> Upon which vouchsafe to look with favourable and propitious countenance, and to accept even as thou wast pleased to accept the gifts of thy righteous servant Abel, and the sacrifice of our Patriarch Abraham, and the spotless offering which thy High Priest Melchizedek offered unto thee.

It should be evident, then, that eucharistic worship and hymnology involve more than ritual and æsthetics, they implicate doctrine. The questions that separate us still from Rome are not merely problems of taste and beauty but of theology; and a Church that divorces ritual from theology is heading for disaster. This is well brought out by Dr. R. S. Franks. He quotes Heitmüller to the effect that rites are attractive because they arouse sensations and moods which admit of manifold interpretations which need not always agree with one another—something in the same way as those who know nothing of the theory of music yet enjoy a symphony for the sensuous and almost hypnotic influence it exercises upon them. Dr. Franks remarks[6]:

> This is very true: it has too often meant that through this manifoldness of significance, the sacraments have afforded an opportunity for the harbouring within Protestantism, or the return into it, of many doctrinal ideas contrary to its essential nature. One of the greatest dangers that besets modern Protestantism is an infection with pre-Reformation doctrine through the insufficiently reflective imitation of pre-Reformation practices in ritual. Accepted to enhance devotion, they presently trail after them a whole crowd of un-evangelical ideas. The best observance of the sacraments for Protestants is the simplest.

Probably Dr. Franks has in mind the *Free Church Book of*

[6] *The Atonement*, 149-150.

Common Prayer. This was a brave attempt to embrace the best in tradition and in modern thought, to be really catholic without excluding those of different ways of thinking. Yet it is doubtful whether the prayer in the longer order, from the Roman Missal, appealing to the saints to intercede on our behalf can be reconciled with an enlightened and evangelical theology. It is true that Rome has omitted the *Epiclesis,* but it may be questioned whether evangelicals should adopt it, for it was at this point that "in some circles the idea of 'transubstantiation' of the elements into 'the body and blood of Christ' first arose[7]".

That the Free Churches do need to be alert and look to their doctrines in eucharistic discussions is evident, because in talks on Reunion dissentients are apt to get swamped in the desire to establish uniformity by a majority vote. A new orthodoxy may be established by excommunicating all who disagree; we may be too eager to renounce the old names of Nonconformist, Dissenter, and Independent. We may illustrate this by a sentence from *The Ministry and the Sacraments,* published for the theological commission of the Faith and Order Movement. The summary statement (p. 44) says that "A condition of union will be the celebration of the Eucharist with the unfailing use of the Words of Institution". This begs several questions. First, which words? The composite version of the Anglican Prayer Book, the Pauline quotation in the *Book of Congregational Worship* and the *Free Church Book,* an indiscriminate assemblage from all sources, or an effort to get back to the historical words? To satisfy the latter demand some such composition as that given in Otto's *Religious Essays,* from Jewish usage, the *Didaché* and Proto-Luke, might well be the most suitable; but we doubt if Anglicans and Orthodox would all accept it. "The unfailing use of the words of Institution" assumes that Jesus pronounced them exactly as Paul has recorded. Yet everyone knows that not a few scholars give good reason to hold that the words of Jesus may have been quite different; the cup may have come first and the only words with it, apart from the grace, a reference to the speedy arrival of the Parousia. Paul alone gives the command to repeat the rite. So many literary and historical questions are involved that the decree of the Commission is almost childishly innocent; or have we here tradition raising its head against scientific theology? The very insistence on the "unchanging" words has a smack of magic about it; the formula must not be altered lest the miracle become impossible of operation.

It is the difficulty of change that has sterilized the Roman Mass, for its thought-forms are outworn. The Church of England suffers from the same defect, so obvious when her new Prayer Book was

[7] J. V. Bartlet in *Christian Worship,* 96.

rejected by Parliament; yet once she did try to combine Roman and Zwinglian forms. In Free Churches, at least, we must allow for experiment and discussion, with liberty and charity, even in these days of centralization and bureaucracy. Experiments do take place on a wide scale, and their results should be co-ordinated so that we may realize our catholic unity. We wonder why there are no representatives in *The Ministry and the Sacraments* of American Congregational and Methodist Churches? Reformed, Lutheran, and Baptist Churches had each several contributors; yet such distinctions can hardly have been fixed upon a basis of numerical membership[8].

We must encourage all experiments that seek to enrich the Church's life. But we must try them with open minds, and be vigilant lest they infringe some vital belief. The whole body of our theological beliefs must be taken into consideration. We shall rejoice that modern Free Church worship, by discarding the medieval Atonement theories, has given us an opportunity of drawing nearer to the evangelical model. This is vital to those who believe, with Dr. Oesterley, that "there is not the slightest trace" in the Gospels that Jesus taught or considered that His death was to be an expiatory sacrifice. The first Christians were those who broke bread most frequently and joyously, thinking upon the victory of Christ, rather than upon the satisfaction of abstract justice in His death. If we wish to communicate frequently, let it be by evangelical principles. So shall we also be participants in the Master's joy and victory.

[8] We may note a mis-statement on p. 519: it is not true that all "Methodists use the Anglican liturgy"; no account is taken of the many Churches that use no liturgy at all. And the reference on p. 237 to the mere "slight changes" in the Wesleyan use of the liturgy is out of date since the new order of 1936, which gives a shorter form, and in the longer form introduces vital changes by the omission of such words as "oblation and satisfaction", indicative of the force of modern atonement theory.

GOLDWIN SMITH—A LIBERAL TEACHER.

By the Rev. F. H. Amphlett Micklewright, M.A.

During the second half of the nineteenth century the cause of liberalism, whether political or religious, found a noteworthy exponent in Professor Goldwin Smith, a man of vast powers and of considerable courage. His resurrection at the present time is important, because much for which he stood is under a cloud. Liberalism is commonly supposed to be in decline. Yet, those for whom the spreading of principles of liberality and of rationality is of importance will refuse this presupposition. It may be true that world-events in the last thirty years have shaken some varieties of liberal philosophy, such as that of an inevitable and gradual moral progress throughout the history of the human race. But they have not overthrown the essential principles of liberalism, a fact emphasized by Dr. Gilbert Murray in his valuable Hibbert Lectures, *Liberality and Civilization,* and re-stated in the political field by Dr. Ramsay Muir. Yet, throughout Europe, the liberal values are engaged in a life and death struggle and it is important that one of the greatest of their exponents should not be forgotten.

In the more restricted field of religion and of church-organization, Goldwin Smith is an excellent illustration of an applied liberalism. He had been brought up in a narrow Evangelicalism which had dropped away in the wider atmosphere of Oxford culture. At Oxford, he had been among the main opponents of Dean Mansel, whose philosophy of theological agnosticism was expounded in the Bampton Lectures of 1858, and who attracted the hostile notice of F. D. Maurice. In later life, Goldwin Smith sought to set Christianity into a wider frame and to relate it to all of the great religions. At the same time, he never abandoned religious worship. In 1868 he left England for good after a family tragedy and lived first in America and then in Canada. The result was that he had a unique view of liberal churchmanship and was able to contrast it at home and in the Dominions. The religious outlook for which he stood has since been sharply challenged, whether by the Protestant theology of Barthianism or by the more Catholic ideas of, for example, *Essays Catholic and Critical.* But Modernists will possess a far closer affinity with him than with his opponents, and the fact that it is their opposition which is heard most of all in the theological world of today renders it important that the distinctive liberalism of Goldwin Smith should be remembered. Above all, he was essentially a layman, and his approach

to religion was always from the lay angle. He formed a very good index to the views of the educated layman of his day and, in spite of clerical reaction, it is possible to suggest that he still provides a clue to the views of men of this type. There is no evidence that the more broadminded laymen have receded, at any rate in religion, from the ideals set forth over thirty years ago in such a work as *Anglican Liberalism*.

Born at Reading in 1823, Goldwin Smith was educated at Eton and Christ Church. At Oxford he was the outstanding member of his college among a group of men of the highest ability, many of whom achieved prominent places in later life. A University prizeman, he graduated in 1848 with a first-class in *Literae Humaniores*, was secretary to the two Oxford commissions, and, from 1858 till 1862, was a member of the Education Commission. In 1859 he was elected Regius Professor of Modern History, a post which he resigned in 1866. Leaving England for good in 1868, he was appointed a Professor at Cornell University, Ithaca, New York. He had long possessed a deep interest in American affairs and did much for the founding of the University, but he was disappointed by the political corruption which succeeded the Civil War and the death of Lincoln. In 1871 this feeling led him to transfer his residence to Toronto and make Canada his home for the rest of his life. His many English admirers sought to tempt him back by offers of seats in Parliament and the Mastership of University College, Oxford, but he refused to leave Canada even at a time when his pro-American politics had brought him considerable social unpopularity. He was, however, a vast force for enlightenment in the Dominion even when his robust radicalism in both politics and religion proved too great for more reactionary and conservative colonial minds. He died in 1910, and his career had covered the greater period of political and religious liberalism.

Goldwin Smith was a prolific author and some of his books are authoritative. *The Political History of England* is possibly the best book of its kind. His works on Canada and the United States of America are still of importance and were valued by Lord Bryce. *The Empire*, a book written whilst he was still at Oxford, is a stern challenge to the jingoist type of imperialism which clouded British politics at the close of the last century. His writings on Ireland contained advice which would have averted much bloodshed had it been followed.

In the religious field Goldwin Smith has left a legacy of books of varying merit, but all well worthy of attention. He entered the lists of theological controversy with *Rational Theology*, his reply to Mansel. For many years he contributed papers to the various quarterlies, pleading for the liberal side in the nineteenth century religious controversy. A short study of Cowper contains his

reflections on Calvinism and Evangelicalism. Towards the close of his life he published *Guesses At The Riddle of Existence* and, under the title, *In Quest of Light,* reprinted a valuable series of letters which he had contributed to the New York newspaper, *The Sun*. In Christology he had moved steadily in a liberal direction and, from this angle, he wrote a very useful sketch of the life of Jesus, *The Founder of Christendom.*

Ecclesiastically, Goldwin Smith was a member of the Church of England, and he desired to see that Church as predominantly a lay body standing for a liberal Christianity against sacerdotalism. He had lived in Oxford during the ebb-tide of the Oxford Movement and lacked all sympathy with it. As a member of the Oxford Commissions he had worked hard to free the University from clerical control. He was a ruthless opponent of church schools for the same reason, and sought to release education from religious tests or from denominational or dogmatic limitations. As he wrote to Roundell Palmer[1]:

> *Sacerdotalism* seems to me at present to be inseparable from Roman Catholicism, and Roman Catholicism seems to me to be false. . . . The exclusive ascendancy of the clergy here [at Oxford] is, and is felt by some of the best of them to be, an evil both to the University and themselves.

Goldwin Smith had originally been fierce for Disestablishment, but later he felt that it would not make for liberty either in dogma or in practice. He came to advocate an Established Church for this reason, a view which he shared with a thinker so emancipated from supernatural religion as Dr. Moncure Conway.

> I would repeal the Act of Uniformity, reform Convocation, introducing a large lay element, make the bishops [——] constitutionally with Diocesan Synods, put an end to private patronage, with the sale of livings, and give the election to the vestry, subject to the approval of the Diocesan Synod[2].

In a short compass, Dr. Goldwin Smith had sketched out a complete liberal programme of church reform which even now has been accomplished only in part. In later life he attended the ministry of Dr. Rainsford at Toronto Cathedral. His latter-day feelings veered round again to an advocacy of Disestablishment, but this was due to the fact that disgust with the support given by the Church of England to the South African war had led him to leave that Church and join an anti-war group of Baptists in Toronto. His later motives were conditioned by his remark, "The pandering of the Churches to the war spirit is very notable and very revolting[3]". The free atmosphere of the Baptist congregation

[1] A. Haultain (ed.), *The Correspondence of Goldwin Smith,* 6.
[2] *Correspondence, &c.,* 176; *cf.* 184.
[3] *Correspondence, &c.,* 359; *cf.* W. S. Rainsford, *The Story of A Varied Life,* 187f.

appealed to him on the grounds that the Baptists have usually stood for peace:

> When the cry was raised to slay the farmers of the Transvaal, burn their homes, turn their wives and children adrift, the voices of some Christian Churches were very plainly heard; that of the Baptist Church I did not hear[4].

Prominent among Goldwin Smith's points of ecclesiastical policy was his rooted aversion to creeds and to tests of church membership, which he regarded as contrary to the spirit of Jesus and as an unwonted limitation of the rights of church members. He was anxious to promote a Christianity based upon conduct, in which the sincerity of membership was to be tested by the closeness with which it approximated to the moral discipleship of Jesus. It was this attitude which gave to him a strong dislike of war.

> But before dogma or formal creeds, Nicene or Athanasian, before the division of sects, with their conflicting confessions and tests, did we not all stand together on a hillside in Galilee over the Lake of Tiberias and see the Founder of Christendom lay its foundations, not in dogma or ecclesiastical formularies, but in a new moral and spiritual life?[5].

The liberal views of churchmanship which he set forth were in sharp opposition to those of the disciples of the Oxford Movement. They are in opposition to those commonly expounded by the clerical party in the Church of England. Yet they are still the views of the majority of educated laymen of the professional classes, and they represent a liberalism which not only accords with the free spirit of rationality but also with the results of modern historical scholarship. However obsolete may be some of his methods, Goldwin Smith was able to contribute the skill of a trained historian to research upon Christian origins. It is the results of these liberal views which are now denied by various forms of theological reaction, whether of the Protestant Barthian type or of the Neo-Anglican school. They can only be safeguarded by a new emphasis upon liberal doctrinal methods. Goldwin Smith was absolutely correct in seeing this as the basis of his practical work, whether in religion or in politics. The liberal approach is set aside by both the clerical party in the Church and the modern totalitarian outlook in politics. It needs a new emphasis. In churchmanship a free attitude towards ecclesiastical organizations can only exist as the outcome of a liberal theology.

In his first theological essays written whilst he was still at Oxford, Goldwin Smith had appreciated this point to the full. His attack upon Mansel, *Rational Theology*, was dictated by a desire to spare religion from the narrow Hamiltonian philosophy and to re-assert the liberal theological background of Coleridge, rather than the more philosophical but less human approach of Bishop

[4] *Correspondence, &c.*, 524. [5] *Correspondence, &c.*, 521.

Butler[6]. The whole book is an attempt to found religion within the human reason and conscience and to attribute religious worth to these activities of humanity. It is worthy of recall that Arminian liberalism was forced to re-assert this truth against Calvinism in the seventeenth century, that Goldwin Smith re-emphasized it against Mansel in the nineteenth century, and that it is once again denied by the Barthians. It is, in fact, the core of liberal theology. In his lectures, *On The Study of History*, he returned to the point, coupling it with the assertion that modern religion is heaving with a mighty earthquake of opinion and that there is a real danger, unless it rises to its opportunities, that much of its place will be taken by a blank materialism. Goldwin Smith made this prophecy in 1865, and time has not belied his words nor softened the challenge[7].

It is interesting that, in spite of their unpopularity in Anglican Oxford, Goldwin Smith always thought highly of the Puritans and of the liberals of the seventeenth century, such as Falkland and the group at Great Tew. In papers contributed to *The Canadian Monthly* and *The Contemporary Review*, he called attention to their high merits. He pointed out that it took Luther two and a half centuries to conquer before the results of the Reformation upheaval could usher in a happier period for Europe, but that the devastation, such as that of the Thirty Years' War, was the prelude to freedom of conscience and thought[8]. Goldwin Smith was attracted by the moral discipline of Puritanism, with its stress upon the freedom of the individual soul before God. He emphasized the fact that Puritanism was a revolution which, like all revolutions, was followed by a period of reaction, but that it made an overwhelming contribution to English culture and was perpetuated in the Nonconformist struggle for freedom in religion. He reminded liberal Anglicans, whose natural sympathy went out to Falkland and Great Tew rather than to Cromwell, that there would have been no Great Tew had not Cromwell and the Puritans overcome Archbishop Laud[9]. Unlike Matthew Arnold, he saw the constant struggle for the values inherent in Puritanism as a necessary and desirable task. The rise and challenge of the Nazi philosophy has shown Dr. Goldwin Smith to have been correct. For Evangelicalism as such he had scant sympathy and regarded it as a befogging of clear thinking[10].

His later work was largely given to the establishing, from history and criticism, of his distinctive positions in religion. He was anxious to plead that the Church should be honest in its teaching with regard to the certain results of Old Testament criticism, that obsolete views of the miraculous should be set aside, and that the

[6] Goldwin Smith, *Rational Religion*, 77. [7] *On The Study of History*, 48f.
[8] *Lectures and Essays*, 67f. [9] *Lectures and Essays*, 235ff.
[10] Cf. Goldwin Smith, *Cowper*, ch. iii.

conception of a future life should be moralized. In *Guesses At The Riddle of Existence* he undertakes this task as an aid to faith. He was always actuated by a desire to protect the essential spirit of religion and, for this reason, was in opposition to substitutes or to attacks upon the religious spirit. He was always[11] in friendly controversy with his great admirer, Sir Leslie Stephen. It was a similar undertaking which prompted the series of letters republished in *In Quest of Light*. Goldwin Smith saw educated men turning from religion owing to the incredible nature of many of the dogmas set forth. He sought to show that the conception of the miraculous was not indigenous to the Gospel narrative but was, in fact, an outgrowth from it which could be shown upon purely historical grounds to be, in all probability, legendary. He was anxious to demonstrate that the Bible gained as a living and human book from criticism and rational study. It was to be associated with the great literatures of all ages. Likewise, he saw Christianity as the peak of religious evolution and not as a thing in itself, the details of which could be separated from all other religions and then used as a basis for argument. He was desirous of producing a churchmanship rooted in a fundamental freedom of thought:

> Dogmatic and miraculous Christianity are at an end. But the vital principles of Christianity, the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, still rest on their historical and moral evidences as a key to the moral problem of our being. At the same time, Christianity, by throwing off dogma and miracle, is rid of one of its heaviest burdens. There is no longer a barrier between Christendom and the rest of humanity[12].

Goldwin Smith affirmed the core of theological liberalism, the worth of human reason as a test of religious truth. He also denied the transcendent authority of an ecclesiastical corporation. He had a view of God acting through nature and man in such a way that there is a fundamental unity of all reality, an essential factor for liberal theology denied by the arbitrary view of Divine activity adopted by the Calvinists and, of recent years, the Barthians. He had set forth the religious views acceptable to a man of culture and education who was also free from professional prejudice or dogmatic presupposition. These things have been commonplaces in liberal religion for many years, but they are again widely challenged and need to be re-asserted. It is only from the sanctions of a liberal theology that a liberal churchmanship may be deduced.

The work which Goldwin Smith had undertaken was the use of liberal methods in order to make Christianity a possible religion for educated men. It was for this reason that he was infuriated by

[11] *Lectures and Essays*, 105; *Guesses At The Riddle of Existence*, 189ff.
[12] *In Quest of Light*, 122.

any attempts at dishonest casuistry in order to lessen the results of knowledge. He regarded Dean Farrar's *Life of Christ* as "one of the most dishonest books I have ever read". He had no great liking for Archbishop Temple, who seemed to him to have receded from the liberalism of his *Essays and Reviews* period, as well as being a supporter of the Boer War[13]. As the years passed he found himself more and more out of sympathy with the majority of ecclesiastical dignitaries both in theology and in social morality.

A recent writer described Goldwin Smith as a forgotten Victorian. Such a description would be apt if the world had progressed beyond the standards which he reached. But, in fact, there has been a retrogression, both in religion and in politics. Goldwin Smith pleaded a broad liberality in religious speculation. This critical and educated attitude is increasingly denied by such attempts to popularize a dogmatic and credal religion as are to be seen, for example, in such work as that of Miss Dorothy Sayers or in the recent Anglo-Catholic series of books, *Signposts*. There is a determined effort to exalt the institution and its officials at the expense of the inner spirit of religion. Again, there is an attempt to limit the freedom of the Church and to provide it with a theology which shall entitle it to act merely as a sacerdotal clique. Goldwin Smith represents the liberal answer to these reactionary endeavours. He set forth a lay Christianity at its highest, and his outlook is still that of the educated layman. His works continue to be worthy of attention by those who wish to see this form of Christianity strengthened and restored to power as a guide to the Church. It has probably never been set forth with greater ability or clarity.

Again, Goldwin Smith never hid the fact that he demanded a high moral standard, both individual and social, from the Church of Christ. To him, it was the Church of Righteousness and consisted of those in every age making conscious moral effort. The failure of the Church of England in this regard when faced with the Boer War led him to leave it and to advocate Disestablishment. He is a reminder that the educated layman does not approve of the compromises and the lowered standard of a political Church, especially when, as in this case, it was an alliance of the Church with political and moral reaction. It is worth recalling that Bishop Lee Hicks of Lincoln was in full agreement with Goldwin Smith on the matter, as also was Bishop Percival of Hereford. Certainly, at a time when all liberalism, whether political or religious, is being challenged, Goldwin Smith is worthy of rescue from oblivion, for in his writings may be found an outstanding defence of liberalism by one of the greatest of its exponents, whose challenge to reaction is again badly needed in every direction and not least in the Church of England.

[13] *Correspondence, &c.*, 363.

APOLOGY FOR ROGUES.

By the Rev. HAROLD E. BERRY, M.A.

IT is surprising how much can be said for bad men. Moralists are wont to tell us that the powers of evil can only appeal to men by assuming the guise of good and by giving vice a semblance of moral justification. But there is some evidence that evil does not always need to resort to disguises. The bad man can claim a standing and a *raison d'être* which are not without cogency.

Thus the rogue may claim that he belongs to the world's most interesting and colourful personalities. He has an attractiveness and a charm which are not conspicuous in people of undeviating rectitude. A Gifford lecturer has recently[1] put the case for the bad man:

> Our reformers might do a great service to humanity if they could explain to us why a diet of milk and water does not appear to suit the human race, why the milksop has never been the hero of romancers, why the biographies of the peace-makers lack readers, why the lives of dare-devils, of buccaneers and smugglers and all manner of wild men captivate youthful souls. . . . Why should courage and reckless daring, even the adroitness and cunning of Ulysses, not conspicuously moral qualities, so entertain and delight us? Why, as Luther enquired, should the devil have all the best tunes?

The same writer instances[2] the charm and attractiveness of Charles James Fox, "all fire, simplicity and sweet temper", who

> spent a quarter of a million on cards and wine before he was twenty-five and fiercely resented any interference with his personal habits. He would lose £16,000 on Tuesday night, speak in the house on Thursday on the Thirty-nine Articles, sit up drinking the remainder of the day at White's, and win £6,000 before leaving for Newmarket on Friday. This was also the man who fought all his life for every liberal principle, for toleration and Catholic emancipation, and who during office abolished the slave-trade. What do you propose to do with such a human volcano? Would you replace him with some bloodless respectability? Perhaps our reformers cherish the secret hope that nature has ceased to produce such men. Let us hope, they pray, that God or nature will refrain from making these upsetting people; another Napoleon, for example, the most splendid genius, Acton thought, who ever trod the earth, who yet had few scruples, sacrificed two million lives,

[1] W. Macneile Dixon, *The Human Situation*, 291. [2] *Ibid.*, 206.

had none the less legions of devoted followers, and built himself a pyramid of remembrance which will crumble only with human memory. . . . The reformers will no doubt see to it that budding Napoleons may be early discovered and strangled in their cradles.

And the Chinese philosopher Lin Yutang puts in[3] a plea for the scamp who sits loose to the rules and conventions of society and whose very irresponsibility is to be preferred to safe and unenterprising virtue:

> In this present age of threats to democracy and human liberty, probably only the scamp and the spirit of the scamp alone will save us from becoming lost as serially numbered units in the masses of disciplined, obedient, regimented and uniformed coolies.

Has not the rogue some ground for saying that he holds a place in the affection of mankind to which not many of the virtuous can lay claim? Why is Falstaff one of our favourite stage characters? Why do children prefer Dick Turpin to Eric? Who does not feel some secret sympathy for Milton's Satan? If the bad man were to disappear from our midst should we not feel that something had gone out of our life that we would fain retain?

Another claim that the rogue might make is that without him the world would be intolerably dull and unrelieved. It is the rogue who provides the element of explosiveness and contrast which saves us from a dead uniformity. "I distrust sainthood", says Lin Yutang[4].

> Imagine a world in which there are no stories of murder in the newspapers, everyone is so omniscient that no house ever catches fire, no aeroplane ever has an accident, no husband deserts his wife, no pastor elopes with a choir girl, no king abdicates his throne for love, no man changes his mind and everyone proceeds to carry out with logical precision a career that he mapped out for himself at the age of ten—goodbye to this happy human world. All the excitement and uncertainty of life would be gone. There would be no literature because there would be no sin, no misbehaviour, no human weakness, no upsetting passion, no prejudices, no irregularities, and worst of all, no surprises. It would be like a horserace in which every one of the forty or fifty thousand spectators knew the winner. . . . Imagine a Dr. Johnson without his bigoted prejudices!

Does not the mind shrink back appalled from such a prospect?

> What sort of a world would it be in which Wesleyanism or Anglicanism ruled the scene, in which throughout its breadth and length not a soul ever kicked over the social traces, in which there were no idlers, or spendthrifts or jesters or Sir

[3] *The Importance of Living*, 14. [4] *Ibid.*, 61.

> Fopling Flutters? Does anyone in his senses really wish for an undiluted respectability throughout eternity[5]?

Do we realize how much we owe to those who make our world interesting and exciting? Do we give due credit to the unscrupulous adventurers without whom we should probably die of boredom? When we dwell on the wonderful ways of Providence and acknowledge the beneficence which anticipated our needs and made all things for our delight, let us not forget to add a thanksgiving for the rake and the criminal who are not the least of our blessings.

Furthermore, it might be contended that bad men make the best leaders, and that to the unprincipled tyrant we owe some of our greatest advantages. Lord Acton has recorded his opinion[6] that "Great men are almost always bad men", and he quotes in support Walpole's dictum that "No great country was ever saved by good men".

Mustapha Kemal may be cited as a modern instance. A man whose private life will not bear examination, to whom cruelty and vice were almost second nature, he yet transformed a weak, divided and war-weary Turkey into a strong, self-sufficient, united nation, and effected a revolution in her social life which was the equivalent of centuries of change in other countries. It is questionable whether so much could have been done by a man of more tender conscience and of greater humanity.

Machiavelli, an admirer of Cæsar Borgia, has in *The Prince* and *The Discourses* put a strong case for unscrupulous ruthlessness and double-dealing on the part of rulers in the interests of public welfare:

> Nevertheless our experience has been that those princes who have done great things have held good faith of little account, and have known how to circumvent those who have placed reliance on their word[7].

No historian, says Macneile Dixon[8], would dare to contradict that bold assertion. Yet on that ground it is not inconceivable that posterity might hail Hitler as the saviour of the German nation who accomplished for his people what more estimable men like Ebert and Stresemann failed to do under the limitations of honour and principle.

In Thornton Wilder's story, *The Bridge of San Luis Rey*, Brother Juniper, perplexed by the apparently undiscriminating incidence of calamity, seeks to fathom the mysteries of Providence by some kind of mathematical computation. The victims of a pestilence are rated on the basis of ten marks for goodness, piety, and usefulness respectively. Brother Juniper's perplexity is only

[5] W. Macneile Dixon, *op. cit.* 187.
[6] See E. H. Carr, *Twenty Years' Crisis*, 129 n.
[7] *The Prince*, c. 15. See Dunning, *A History of Political Theories*, 299.
[8] *The Human Situation*, 286.

increased, however, when he discovers that Manuel B., who has full marks for goodness and piety, gains only nil for usefulness, whereas Alfonso V, who can be given only minus eight for goodness and minus ten for piety, yet has full marks for usefulness. It is not suggested that a man's usefulness is in inverse proportion to his goodness and piety, but there is authority for saying that the children of this world are wiser than the children of light, and presumably the world may derive some benefit from that wisdom.

To admit that, as it takes all kinds of people to make a world, there may be a place for the rogue as well as for the saint, would nullify completely the work and practice of the Christian community. The avowed object of the Church is the elimination of bad men, and to that end it is largely occupied with exhorting to repentance, reforming bad characters, elevating public morals, and waging war on vice. The answer of the Christian theologian to the apologist for rogues would probably be: "Sin is sin, however attractive it may be and however much may be said for it from the human point of view. The Christian can have no parley with sin since it is an offence against God. The bad man, whatever his charm or however great his achievements, is a sinner and must be saved from his sins. So *qua* sinner he must cease to exist".

This for the Christian is, of course, conclusive, though it will not weigh so much with those who do not accept the Christian view of sin. Thus Emerson criticizes Swedenborg on this point:

> I object to his cardinal position in morals that evils should be shunned as sins . . . I shun evils as evils. Does he not know—Charles Lamb did—that every poetic mind is a pagan and to this day prefers Olympic Jove, Apollo and the Muses and the Fates to all the barbarous indigestion of Calvin and the Middle Ages?

But whether one accepts the Christian position or not, there are certain points about the case for rogues as presented above that are open to question.

The charm and attractiveness of the bad man are for the most part fictitious. The philosopher in the calm seclusion of his study may dwell on the delightful qualities of the rogue, but in real life he would probably give him a wide berth. We may laugh at Falstaff and enjoy his antics on the stage, but in real life we should almost certainly want to kick him. When an enthusiastic reviewer described the crew of one of Conrad's ships as "engaging ruffians", Conrad retorted that he did not know what an "engaging" ruffian was, adding that he had met many ruffians, but none of them was engaging.

Villainy can be made to appear colourful and romantic through distance in space or time, but at close quarters we do not find that

it appeals to us. We like reading detective thrillers, but all the same we are grateful for the policeman who patrols our beat and hope never to encounter a burglar in the flesh or to be mixed up in a murder.

This may indicate lack of spirit on our part, or it may be evidence of progress, but at any rate it does dispose of the argument that the rogue has, outside the pages of fiction or history, an inalienable place in our affections or that he is indispensable to our happiness.

The claim that the bad man may often be a public benefactor also calls for examination. Lord Acton commands respect as an historian, but his statement that "great men are seldom good men" cannot pass unchallenged. A host of names leap to mind to refute the assertion, although, of course, a lot depends on one's definition of greatness. If we accept the validity of Kant's principle, "Act only on that maxim whereby thou canst at the same time will that it should become a universal law", we can see how this excludes even some of the "great" ones, since their conduct, if universally adopted, would lead to chaos and would make society impossible. Benefits conferred by those whose methods and practice cannot be universalized must be regarded as dubious.

To assert that nations are usually saved by bad men really seems to mean that bad men are usually more successful than good men in giving their country strength and unity and making it a force to be reckoned with in the councils of the nations. To "save" the nation in this sense is to make it militarily, economically, and politically mighty, and no one can deny that in that respect ruthless tyrants and Machiavellian statesmen have a way with them. But it is also true that a nation may gain the whole world and lose its soul, and it is questionable whether the great man who assists in this process can in any true sense be regarded as a "saviour". The services rendered by these great ones seem to be such as count only in the context of competing nations and rival imperialisms. In a world organized on different lines, in which higher values than national prestige and economic power prevailed and the good of any section of mankind could be secured otherwise than at the point of the sword, these "saviours" would surely lack employment.

In contrast to these great men so admired by Machiavelli and Lord Acton and Walpole, it might be considered how far a man like John Wesley may be said to have saved England in a very critical period, and what any country owes to the presence of men and women who, whether great or not, have some claim to be considered good. It may be true that

> The healing of the world
> Is in its nameless saints.

There remains the warning that a world from which bad men were eliminated would be intolerably dull and uninteresting. This may be a matter of personal preference, and *de gustibus* . . . Some people may actually like a world in which an amiable hooligan, aided and abetted by unscrupulous politicians and vested interests, can precipitate a process of mutual extermination. Some may really enjoy the glorious uncertainties and excitements created by men of cunning and cruelty, and would feel ill at ease in a world without its record of double-dealing and sordidness.

But need it be assumed that a world minus its bad men would be so unbearably dull? Winifred Holtby in one of her whimsical papers[9] describes the visit to Hell of a reformer who was appalled to find that it was peopled with great saints like Calvin, Knox, Savonarola, and Florence Nightingale. When he protests against the injustice of it, he is reminded that such men get their reward on earth by the zest and interest of their life, the power they wield and the fame they attain. It is also pointed out that the rest and tranquillity of Heaven would be too tame for such spirits.

This flight of fancy does serve to suggest that a world peopled by saints would not necessarily be dull even though unrelieved by the presence of rogues. A collection of such varied and fiery souls as St. Paul, St. Francis, Luther, and Cromwell could never be tame. A more modern selection such as Wilfred Grenfell, Mary Slessor, Wilson of the Antarctic, Kagawa, and Albert Schweitzer, disposes of the claim that villains have the monopoly of romance and the spirit of adventure. If it be objected that the average saint is very dull, we may reply, So is the average bad man, and often disgusting and repellent withal. Dick Turpin is not the typical rogue, and Raffles does not represent the average burglar.

Those who view with apprehension the prospect of a rogueless world need not be unduly alarmed, as the likelihood of such a state of things seems sufficiently remote to be of little more than academic interest. But to allay the fears of such lovers of villainy, I think we may say with confidence that even a world in which a bad man was unknown would not lack adventure or humour or discovery or uncertainty or danger, and would present all those challenges to the human spirit which make the difference between life and existence.

It may be, however, that in seeking thus to expose the moral fallacies of the apologist for rogues we are barking up the wrong tree. May not the key to the problem be found in the realm of psychology? A psychologist would perhaps find in the fascination which villainy has for so many of us an instance of the mental mechanisms of fantasy or compensation:

> When we see a play or read a novel, we do it "to escape

[9] *Truth is not Sober.*

> from ourselves", or to "kill time", phrases which unconsciously reveal that we see in those new worlds of adventure and desire some fantasy of our own lives writ plain. The emotion which catches us as we follow the imaginary, is a transferred emotion, for into those strange desires we read our own longings for freedom and fantasies of greatness[10].

Thus our predilection for the cut-throats such as we find in *Treasure Island* may indicate the presence in our subconscious mind of the buccaneering spirit which the restraints and discipline of civilized life have driven underground. The avidity with which we read such books as *The Three Musketeers* may be evidence that behind our respectable and benevolent exteriors there are deep-seated affinities with the swashbuckler and the intriguer. Unable to give vent to the anti-social urges of our nature, we find compensation in a vicarious roguery through the exploits of the bad men of fiction and history. This is confirmed by so eminent an authority as Prof. W. E. Hocking of Harvard[11]:

> It is in the world of art, of letters, of fairly distant history —in brief, it is in the world of imagination (for remote history takes on imaginative quality) that Falstaff, Aspasia, The Jolly Friars, Lucretia Borgia, Tam O'Shanter, Don Juan, and all the other heroes and heroines of the morally unstrenuous life have their rightful sphere. They are the glorified fringes of our too sharp cut and self-righteous ideals. Their human value lies in the respiration they afford to repressed possibilities within us, their conspiracy with our own genius and invention, not in the actual frailty or vice which they embody.

Hence it appears that the answer to the apologist for rogues must come, not from the moralist or the theologian, but from the psycho-analyst. The apologist's advocacy of the black sheep of society may turn out to be but the rationalization of his own primitive desires and impulses. He is but betraying the presence of the same mental mechanisms which operate in us all.

Therefore we need have no misgivings lest our well-meaning attempts to eliminate or transform the world's evil-doers should prove to be misguided, or lest our zeal for reform should make the world a less desirable place to live in. Reassured by the new psychology we can with a good conscience echo the prayer of St. Joan: O God that madest this beautiful earth, when will it be ready to receive Thy saints? How long, O Lord, how long?

[10] J. A. C. Murray, *Introduction to a Christian Psycho-Therapy*, 109.
[11] *Human Nature and Its Remaking*, 132.

THE NECESSITY FOR RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE.

By the Rev. W. E. Sargent, M.A., B.D., Ph.D.

In days when churches are carrying a heavy burden and responsibility through the diminishing of their congregations it will be as well to remember that every form of Christian religion necessitates personal experiences of God's grace, and that these are the very flesh and blood of every Congregational Church, the vitality of which is measured by the religious certainty and activity of its members. Many Christian people shy very much at the idea of personal religion, partly because they dread claiming what they may fail to demonstrate in their own individual lives, and partly because they feel that a direct experience of God is something which only the mystics can enjoy. The attitude of many Church people towards the idea of sensing God's presence is defensive and unenterprising: defensive in the sense that they should and must guard against the possible charge of hypocrisy; unenterprising in so far as they feel that only the mystic has it within his nature to experience the Divine Presence, and since they have no sure proofs of being mystics themselves it is futile ever to search for something which they are incapable of finding. In a word, they are dominated by the feeling of not-worthwhileness, which is a pernicious disease of the spirit.

Now both these ideas are the fruits of faulty teaching and erroneous thinking. In the first place, personal religion does not necessarily mean perfect sainthood, however that might express itself. Besides, we have no standard with which to judge the sainthood or perfection of a man—to say nothing of a woman! Standards vary from age to age, and even from society to society within a given age. Jesus claimed a personal religion; His very teachings are centred in it; but He was regarded as a blasphemer by the religious authorities of His day.

Because a man professes personal religion in the sense of experiencing God's presence and activity within himself, it does not necessarily mean that he will do those things which are well-pleasing to his family, friends, Church officials, State or country. From what Jesus has said it is evident that personal contact with Him meant a possible rising up against our loved ones: "For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daugh-

ter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law'' (*Matt.* 10[35]). But what personal religion does for men and women is to make them realize that the teachings of Jesus are not only good ethics, but a way of life, the dynamic of which is the power of God working through our personalities, enabling us to adjust ourselves better to the circumstances and changing conditions of life. When this experience comes to the individual he is prepared to say, ''One thing I know, that whereas I was blind I now see''; or, to quote from the Fourth Gospel, the words of the woman who cried, ''Come, see a man who told me all the things that ever I did''.

How he will express in his church this experience will of course depend largely on his temperament: the extravert will probably emphasize words and public works or service, the introvert will be content to act quietly and avoid detection; both will exercise an influence, but the former will be like the sparking-plugs of a motor-engine, setting on fire the power of the church; and the latter like the fragrant perfume of the ointment that was broken over the head of our Lord in the house at Bethany.

Then in the second place, it must not be thought for one moment that the personal experience of Jesus, or of mystics like Paul and Augustine, is confined to them alone, and that we can have no share in it. By no means. If we are all the children of God, then all are equally privileged to share His fellowship. There is something within each of us that makes possible a response to the Divine and to all its manifestations, just as the retina of the eye responds to light and colour. Precisely what the nature of this responsive element is we cannot tell, but that should not prevent us from using it. And I do not think for one moment that Jesus would ever have exhorted His hearers to accept a Son-Father relationship with God if such were impossible for some of them. To have done so would have been tantamount to dishonesty, or at least to a complete misunderstanding of human nature, and for that reason alone we could no longer accept Him as our authority, friend, and guide. If we believe in Him as our spiritual leader, then we must seek the religious experience He enjoyed, and seek until we find it, as He enjoined all who followed Him. Dean Inge, in *Christian Mysticism,* points out that the saints, who are in very close agreement with each other in this, are confident of the possibilities of holding intercourse with God. They not only see manifestations of the Divine, but also ''feel His presence within them as the very life of their life''. They tell us that what separates us from Him is self-seeking and sensuality in all their forms; but that there *is* a path leading to God is beyond all disputation.

Let me now repeat that seeking and even enjoying fellowship with God does not mean surely that we shall be 100 per cent

Christians; that is an ideal to which we approximate. Perfection means a striving towards the Christian ideal, and not necessarily the realization of it. But once the striving begins we are vitally concerned not only with our own personal religion, but also with joining others in worship and spreading the good news. A congregation of men and women who know what it means to experience God's abiding presence will remain faithful to the principles of their Church, they will sacrifice for them, and like the very early Christians will present a living witness of what the family of God is for all who believe in Him. These are the men for whom religious experience is no illusion, who will stand firmly and resolutely by the Church, who will pilot her through stormy and treacherous seas, and never forsake her, even though the going is hard and demands everything they have to give. Their energies both in and outside their church will be the energies of the Holy God, their power will be that of Him who controls the universe of which we are but a fragment, and their understanding of human nature and its many problems will be quickened and deepened by the stimulating influence of the Eternal Spirit.

To say all this is not to utter a platitude. No! It declares a fact of human experience, one which is capable of demonstration by those who really believe that "God is a spirit with whom the human spirit can hold intercourse". To quote from Dean Inge:

> As [*these men*] have toiled up the narrow way, the Spirit has spoken to them of Christ, and has enlightened the eyes of their understanding till they have at least begun to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge and to be filled with all the fulness of God.

In our congregations there are some to whom this description would truly apply; they toil unceasingly, give generously and sacrifice freely, not because they are tied to their church by hereditary or traditional bonds, but because the richness of their religious experience overflows their hearts and finds its way to the hearts of others through the avenues of service and devotion.

Whilst we are able to rejoice in the knowledge that there are men and women in our Church who, like St. Paul, are able to commend themselves "to every man's conscience in the sight of God", we would wish there were many more to bear the burden of the future Church. None who can prophesy by grappling with present issues will deny that the forward march of the Church is over a steep and precipitous path. There are critics always ready to undermine our influence, but we are not so much afraid of the honest thinker who fails to accept the Christian religion because of intellectual difficulties. Men like Julian Huxley and J. B. S. Haldane stimulate our thinking, and, unwittingly to themselves, prevent us from being theologically smug and complacent. Even

Shaw and Wells have a converse contribution to make to religious thought, and people like D. H. Lawrence and the Freudian psychologists provoke us to attack any teaching that makes for a distorted view of human nature and desire. We are nevertheless challenged, not only in the front of our advance by the atheists, but also on the flank and in the rear by all kinds of secularists who are discontented with life as they know it, and who are eager for some kind of revolutionary movement to oust Christianity or relegate it to the archives. Still, their challenge and attacks will keep us fighting-fit, but only so long as we are in contact with Him Who is the head of the Church, and do not allow His cause to be obscured by subtle egotism. What I personally am afraid of is not so much the active resistance of thinking people to the Church as the careless indifference of those who believe that religion is not worth while and for that reason are closed to all argument. It is not difficult to see why this attitude prevails among a high percentage of people. The apparent inefficacy of prayer, the seeming impracticability of the Christian beliefs, the problem of suffering, are always, for the unthinking, pegs on which to hang their unbelief; and it is unfortunate that the majority of these people spread their apathy to the young, who grow up among increasingly pagan influences. I do not, however, despair of the Church ever winning the young of today, and the men and women of future generations. In fact I believe that the ground will be healthier, rather than otherwise, for us to work in. It will at least be free from the many psychological inhibitions which are the result of twisted and distorted thinking, and more ready to receive without hindrance the seed of the Spirit.

But to meet the growing opposition and indifference to the gospel of Christ we need more men and women who by virtue of their personal Christian experience will demonstrate the reality of their beliefs, and persuade those outside the Church to join us in worship and in the building of a new world order. Now it is not enough merely to state this fact, or even to appeal to our own Church folk to aim for nothing less than an experience of communion with God. To tell them that it will come, first through desiring the experience, and secondly through an acceptance of God's grace, often leaves them guessing and bewildered. There are many who are eager to fulfil both these conditions, but who after doing so can still make no claim to a personal knowledge of what God is able to do for those who believe and trust Him.

A man tells me that he wants to believe in God and to feel the Divine influence at work in his own life, but that however much he strives to obtain this experience it just does not come. To tell him that it will come if he remain patient and faithful to his purpose only irritates him. This kind of pious advice is due to a

failure to understand the man's real problem, *viz.*, the removing of the inhibitions partly repressing the religious feelings which normally express themselves through communion with the Holy God. That there are factors inhibiting the freedom of the religious life no student of psychology can deny, and so long as they remain unconscious and beyond the knowledge and reach of the individual the mere wishing for an experience of communion with God will not help a great deal.

A young woman known to me has for some years lived a very isolated life because she does not know how to associate with others; when in their presence not all the king's horses and all the king's men can drag words from her lips. Recognizing her handicap and desiring to overcome it she consulted her minister, who advised her to join a club, and when on holiday to stay at a young people's holiday centre. The advice was accepted, but instead of helping it made her even more conscious of her trouble. It took some long time to find out the inhibitions to her social life, and even now she is not a great deal better, though sufficiently so to be able to follow the profession of a nurse fairly successfully. No amount of wishing could make this girl different; the cause of her trouble was beyond her reach, and only the expert could deal with it.

In a similar way there are men and women in our churches who desire a living experience of fellowship with God; and any one who reflects on what this can mean to the individual will readily understand the desire of the human heart to obtain it. But if many dare to be frank and confess what they believe to be true of themselves, they will say as my mother did when I was about fifteen: "I try to be good and serve the Church, but I just don't know what the minister means when he speaks about fellowship with God". People may desire the experience, but for some reason they cannot get it, however sincere or patient they may be.

Let me illustrate. A young woman attending a certain School Conference some years ago listened eagerly to a series of lectures given on "Communion with God". Before the Conference she felt that a personal experience of God's grace would make her a better Sunday School teacher, and I am confident that never has there been a more genuine desire expressed by any one for a first-hand knowledge of the Divine Presence. After the Conference she spoke to the lecturer, and asked how she might obtain communion with God; and he replied: "Oh, it just comes if you want it hard enough". But it did not come, and she began to despair, and sometimes she wondered whether people were being deluded by preachers who preached much stuff and nonsense about what was not humanly possible. What *she* needed was the help of someone who was able to release the inhibitory forces of pent-up

resentment which were driving down the religious feeling within her; and later, as this work was being accomplished, there came to her the unfolding of her personality in a manner that brought forth a greater responsiveness to the Divine Presence around her, which formerly she could not sense because the religious urge was repressed.

Let me quote another case. A man eager for fellowship with God found that each time he prayed he felt that his prayers were more or less futile, since there was little or no awareness of any response. The desire for the experience, and the patience to wait for the coming of God's presence to his life, were there all right, but nothing ever happened. He, too, began to feel that perhaps the experience was only for the mystic, and therefore all that he could do was to be good and attend church on Sundays. However, an analysis of his case soon revealed that he was equating God—the Heavenly Father—with his own father, a man who had little time for his children and never encouraged them to discuss their problems with him. This unconscious association was enough to make the man feel that God, too, could never be sufficiently interested in him to listen to his prayers and enter into communion with him.

Every minister meets those who desire an intimate knowledge of God but who never have the desire satisfied. And whilst few may come to us and confess their difficulties, what of the many who listen to preachers—both ministers and laymen—speaking about the deep things of the spiritual life, but who never experience these things for themselves, and who hesitate to reveal their failure because they feel the subject of religion too embarrassing even to discuss? Not even in our pastoral work can we overcome this difficulty of getting men and women to talk about the personal features of their religious lives. It is easier both for them and us to discuss every subject under the sun except religion. This is partly the result of feeling, as I have already pointed out, that one should never talk about spiritual things, because it is pious to do so: one should live religion, and as long as one does not talk about it one may escape being misjudged if he should happen to fail in practising what he professes.

This, of course, is wrong, and for two reasons. In the first place, if religion does really matter to us, why should we not discuss it among ourselves? We never hesitate to speak of our common experiences of life, and if perchance we have found a remedy for some bodily ill we readily recommend it to others who may be suffering in a similar way. Why should we, then, keep to ourselves the experiences of Divine help, guidance, and consolation, when the unpretentious telling of them will encourage others to find the true and living God? I am not pleading for the tech-

nique of the Group Movement; that can afford a dangerous opportunity for the display of egotism and exhibitionism—though even here we have much to learn. But I do believe that much of the dynamic of the first Christians came through their spiritual testimonies and natural conversations about what the risen Christ had done for them. Secondly, it is a misunderstanding of human nature to expect a hundred per cent Christian living in the man who confesses his allegiance to the Master. The human personality is made up of impulses that can easily get out of control; and often they get the better of us, not because we desire the wrong, but because we are influenced by long-forgotten experiences that are still at work within us. Even St. Paul knew how ungovernable human nature could be: "The good that I would I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do". When we realize any one weakness in ourselves, such as egotism, selfishness, or resentment, then as Christians we should try to eradicate it, and strive to produce a personality that worthily reveals the glory of God.

Now it sometimes happens that some persisting evil trait of character is not realized by its owner, but its very presence inhibits the freedom of the religious life in so far as the individual fails to enjoy the fellowship of God. It is here, I think, that the Church has a part to play in placing at the disposal of her members the science of psychology, the purpose of which is to assist in the development of the human personality. Those psychologists who have used their science to explain away religion are condemned by the very method they have employed to justify—but really only to rationalize—their own unbelief. Modern psychology, particularly that of the American and English schools, is not opposed to religion or antagonistic to Christian teaching; it is in effect like every other branch of science, a handmaid of religion which offers to help men and women in their search for a deeper understanding and a richer experience of life. In my work as a psychologist, which my church generously permits me to do, I never introduce the subject of religion to the people who consult me. The subject is broached first by them, and I can honestly say that few have left me without expressing a sincere desire to know God. This is not only my own personal experience, it is that of others too. They, like me, have found that through releasing the human personality there comes a greater and stronger desire for God.

Since, then, it is part of the purpose of the Church to help her members to obtain that heightened religious experience which we call communion with God, ought not she to find a place for the Christian psychologist? It cannot be expected of every minister to know enough of this very human science to perform the task of the specialist on behalf of his people who desire thus to be helped

because it needs not only knowledge of psychology, but also much personal experience, to accomplish results. Nevertheless, every minister should be equipped with at least sufficient knowledge to recognize particular needs, and to be able to refer people to one who, in co-operation with him, will make it possible for them to fulfil the greatest desire of the human heart, which is to know personally the love of God. Dr. William Brown, one of our leading psychologists, says in one of his books that as a result of a psychological analysis, undertaken for scientific purposes, he found a greater religious freedom, and possibly for the first time knew what it meant to have a rich Christian experience. Ought not the Church, then, in its aim to build up the kingdom of God through the medium of human personalities, to value and utilize the science that can help to achieve this?

Congregationalism depends for its future existence on the personal religion of its members. It is true to say that Congregationalism, which is a spiritual democracy, is based on the individual spiritual experiences of its members, who, when united as a community we call a church, desire to express themselves with freedom in worship, teaching and government. We may well plead for a more robust Congregationalism, a greater appreciation and acceptance of the privileges that are ours. As a denomination I believe we have an important contribution to make to the religious life of our country, and of a kind that must make itself felt, not only in preserving the ideals of democracy, but in helping to give the right kind of lead in the making of a lasting future peace.

None can deny that the permanent grounds of a lasting peace are spiritual and not national. The spiritual grounds are founded and established only by men and women whose religion is personal, and whose vision of the future is due not only to a clear analysis of present issues, but also to the kind of synthesis that is inspired by the most Holy God. Let us then, for the sake of our Church, the principles of democracy, and the peace of the world, deepen our own personal religion, encourage others by the example of our lives to seek again the God and Father of us all, and place at their disposal the help that science can offer; so that their search will not be in vain, but rewarded with an experience that will make them keenly desirous of following Him who is the Head of our Church and the true Prince of Peace.

PITY THE POOR CONGREGATIONALIST.

By the Rev. H. D. BEDFORD.

"I HAVE learned", wrote St. Paul to the Christians at Philippi, "in whatsoever state I am, therewith to be content".

In this—as probably in a number of other respects—the average Congregational minister falls far short of St. Paul. The Congregational ministry is seething with a suppressed and ill-concealed discontent. And the discontent gnawing at our vitals is not to be described as a divine discontent. Quite otherwise. Most of my brethren have a naïve belief that they would be happy and content in a slightly stronger church in a lovelier district in which the Congregational tradition is more vigorous. They believe that with a little luck they might have been in such a church, and with a little luck may still be. They justify the cynical remark of the poet who said that a Congregational minister "never is, but always to be blest".

And congregations, for their part, tend to underline this discontent. The congregation with a brand-new minister is pathetically superior to a congregation with a shop-soiled one. The new man, unless he is an expert, has hardly yet had time to make many enemies. He has the interest of the people in that he *is* the new man. Attendances at the Sunday services increase. People turn out who got tired of the old man and his ways. New methods are tried out, and each innovation—always provided it is the work of the new man—is put down to him for righteousness. Reforms which would normally have been hotly debated for many months at the church meeting are accomplished in the twinkling of an eye—under the new man! The people of our churches do as a rule quite gladly accept the advice of St. Paul to "put off the old man and put on the new".

The logical way of dealing with a situation like this is the Methodist way of a general post every so many years. Even the slaves in Israel had their Sabbatic year of deliverance, and I have heard a Congregational minister say that seven years was "a very nice time" at which to place a period to a ministry. But the Methodist way involves central control with a consequent limitation of the freedom of the individual congregation—and that would never do. The Memorial Hall had better not try it on.

The crux of the problem lies with the vacant church and the discontented parson. The parson would not be so discontented

could he believe in the existence of some mechanism designed to translate him from his present sphere of labour in Lesser Muddlecombe to the more important charge of Bigger Moneypool. The one thing he does see clearly is that there is no such mechanism. Only too well he knows the way in which "calls" come to pass.

He knows that: (*a*)

The bounder writes to the vacant church to recommend himself—and being what he is, the bounder naturally recommends himself very highly. He may even credit himself with an impressive degree conferred on him by the Borstal Old Boys' Theological Senatus. That this method of securing a welcome change of pastorate is not uniformly unsuccessful is a tribute to the naïvety of many a deacons' court and vacancy committee. Perhaps it is still another case of the triumph of hope over experience, and the deacons of Bigger Moneypool, having read our ministerial friend's account of himself, may well be led to suppose that here, at last, and bound up in a single gifted individual, are all the high qualities of a Leslie Weatherhead, a Sidney Berry, a J. Ernest James, and a B. C. Plowright—minus their notorious failings.

He knows that: (*b*)

He may have a stroke of luck. He may, for instance, be caught preaching a good sermon. Some influential member of the Bigger Moneypool church may spend a week-end in Lesser Muddlecombe. He may hear the Lesser Muddlecombe man preach his good sermon and be so impressed by the performance that when, soon after, a vacancy occurs in Bigger Moneypool, the Lesser Muddlecombe man is asked to preach "with a view". It is then up to him.

There are still other ways in which the desired haven may be reached. It may be that the Lesser Muddlecombe man has some other method of approach to the Bigger Moneypool church. A benevolent layman, or an old college chum, may reside within the Bigger Moneypool area. A tactful note of appeal at such a moment may produce results. It is a thin chance, but in these days of intense competition a man who is in earnest about his career must leave no stone unturned, no avenue unexplored, and no barrel untapped. There is one thing that no Congregational minister in his senses should do—and that is, write to the Moderator. This counsel should be inscribed in letters of gold, for it is almost a recipe for success in itself. A little consideration will reveal the reason for this. A Moderator is usually a tired, elderly gentleman already overburdened with cares and anxieties. The inconsiderate desert traveller who adds the last straw to a burden already piled all too high does not endear himself to the camel. Similarly, the minister who adds correspondence and anxiety to the busy and worried mind of the Moderator is doing

nothing to recommend himself to that worthy official. The only sane attitude to adopt towards the Moderators is to leave well alone, and let sleeping Moderators lie. Moderators naturally have a kindly feeling towards men who never, in any circumstances, write to them.

But what then is the fate of the average hardworking but unspectacular minister of the Gospel[1]? He does not care to write enthusiastic letters of self-commendation. For him—let us face facts—apart from some such lucky chances as those noted above, there is little hope. He is stuck where he is. He must endure until he dies, or his church dies, whichever event occurs first. He might do good work in some other church. There may be a vacancy in the pastorate of Bigger Moneypool. But all to no purpose; for how is the Vacancy Committee of the Bigger Moneypool church to be made aware of the existence of our friend?

This is a question to which, so far as I know, Congregationalism offers no answer. Methodism and the circuit system no doubt has its disadvantages, but it has one great advantage, namely, that under the Methodist system a man knows—and his congregation knows that he knows—that his is not a life sentence. The Methodist system has this further advantage that the Methodist bosses get to know their men. I cannot think it likely that when the High Priests of Methodism want to select a man for transference from Lesser Muddlecombe to Bigger Moneypool they simply close their eyes and stick a pin into the list of the Methodist ministry. That may be the method of blind faith, and in practice it might work out exceedingly well, but I can hardly believe that it is the Methodist method. No; they walk by knowledge not by faith. They ponder the case of the Rev. J. Wesley Jones, and they decide that although he may have made a sad mess of things at Bigger Moneypool he may nevertheless do very well at Lesser Muddlecombe. While of J. Epworth Jones they say that since he has done so well at Lesser Muddlecombe let him have his chance at Bigger Moneypool! But as to the poor Congregational pastor—who knows what he has done or failed to do? So what chance is there that the Rev. J. Macleod Evans, who by superhuman efforts has managed to prevent the small Congregational cause at Steeltown from dying on his hands, may as a reward find his name on the short leet of the vacancy committee of Beulah-by-the-Sea? The people of Beulah-by-the-Sea may have read in the *Christian World* about Leslie Weatherhead and James Black and one or two other prominent men, but they have never even heard of the Rev. J. Macleod Evans.

And that is the real trouble. It is not that in Congregationalism we do not love one another, but that we do not even know

[1] *E.g.*, the writer of this article.

one another. And there is at present no machinery for permitting us to know one another. As things are, consider the position of the average congregation when they are on the look out for a new minister. What do the people of the church know about the ministerial market? Rather less than the average housewife knows about stocks and shares. They know that there is a vague army of men in clerical grey occupying territories ranging from the North of Scotland to Devonshire. They know that some of these parsons they do *not* want, and will not have, at any price. But in that vague, parsonic underworld there may be men who would suit them well and do good work in their midst. Their problem is how to get into contact with one or two such men, so that from these one or two they may make their final choice. Most of us have watched churches commit *felo-de-se* by the very simple process of choosing a man of whom they had all too little real knowledge.

When I was young and romantic I imagined that for every man in the world there was somewhere a predestined soul-mate, and that somehow, sooner rather than later, these two would meet, mate, and live happily ever after. But I am not now so romantic as to believe that there is a single predestined and ideal pastor for every church. It is true, generally speaking, that a people get the pastor they deserve. If the pews are wooden, they get a wooden preacher; if the pews are populated they get a popular preacher. But that there is an ideal pastor for every congregation, and an ideal congregation for every parson, is not borne out by experience. The vacant church knows that there are men to be had--good and faithful men who, though they have not written to the Moderators and have not been making frantic efforts to get away from their present charge, are nevertheless ready for a change when a change comes their way.

The most fruitful suggestion I can offer is that a nation-wide pulpit exchange be arranged for one month in every year, with the understanding that all ministers move into a county other than their own for the period of the exchange. Such an exchange would add interest and a much needed variety to the average minister's life, and an element of adventure to the dull routine of the average church's year. And then, when a vacancy did at length occur, members of a congregation would be in a position to say: "What about that young man we had in the spring of nineteen-forty-two? We all liked him—let us give *him* a hearing!"

I quite realize that this may appear to be a somewhat hare-brained proposal, but I put it forward, confident in the belief that it is the most hare-brained schemes that generally win their triumphant way on to the statute books of Congregationalism.

DIPPING INTO THE FUTURE.

A GRAND STRATEGY FOR CONGREGATIONALISM?

By Leslie E. Cooke, B.A., B.D.

The year 1942 will see Congregationalism bracing itself for the great task of raising £500,000 to supplement compensation money which the State has promised to pay for the restoration and repair of damaged church buildings. The necessity of raising a reconstruction fund is beyond question: that the time is opportune in spite of everything will, I think, be generally agreed, for there is "more money about" than in the pre-war years; that the task will be successfully accomplished is certain. The completion of this scheme and the putting of it into effect at this time are good tactics. The development of these tactics, however, has only served to throw into relief the question of our grand strategy. We have an immediate short-term policy; what of our long-term plan?

The specific demands upon the reconstruction fund have been defined thus:—

(1) To rebuild bombed churches where necessary.

(2) To help churches which have been damaged or destroyed to move into new areas, if, in their present situation, they cannot render the fullest possible service.

(3) To make provision for normal church extension.

Beneath these aims there is implied the provision of ministerial help, until churches can stand on their own feet again. All these should win the full approval of the lovers of our churches everywhere.

There are, however, other problems and difficulties for the solution of which this scheme does not provide, but which demand urgent and serious consideration. Some of these problems have been with us for years, such as those of ministerial settlements and removals, and the plight of our village churches—especially where they are situated in the immediate vicinity of our great cities, where the advance of industrialization has destroyed communal life. There are other problems which have been created by the war. The Government policy with regard to theological students threatens a serious shortage of man-power over a period of years, and previous experience warns us against the mistake of trying to meet that difficulty by drastic curtailment of the years of a student's training.

In some of our cities situations which we could foresee as inevitable ten or twenty years hence have been thrust upon us overnight. Churches which were gradually becoming "down town" and redundant in city centres, but which could still look forward to long years of usefulness, have had their buildings demolished. The question concerning the possibility, not to mention the advisability, of rebuilding on the *old* site has been raised. Changes are imminent in the form of our Church life. For years now, in industrial centres, the morning congregations have been decreasing, and the desirability of having two almost exactly similar services has been open to question. The war has inspired our churches to new ventures—both in the form of community service, and in new ways of evangelism, so it may be that we shall need buildings of a different type, and of greater adaptability to these new methods. This applies particularly to our work amongst young people. Hitherto the design for new premises has been controlled to a large extent by the idea of the *graded* Sunday School. Grading undoubtedly has taught us a lesson which we needed to learn, but the future lies, or should lie, with the idea of the *Family* Church, and all future building should perhaps be controlled by that idea.

There are evidences also of changes outside our own church polity. While it would be foolish to prophesy, there seems little doubt that certain forms of Government control have come to stay. The provision by the Government of Youth Training Organizations, and the vital interest of the State in the welfare of its young people, which this reveals, seem likely to be permanent. Much of the "Welfare" work among the young, which has hitherto been the concern of voluntary organizations, will henceforth be directed and provided for by a State department. This is at once a challenge and an opportunity. It seems likely that for some years rebuilding will be directed by the State controlling both labour and materials. It is difficult to envisage how the damaged church premises can be restored otherwise. A recent estimate for replanning the Coventry city centre, for example, puts the cost at £10,000,000. It is clear that no local authority could possibly bear such a burden as that—having the work done by private tender, without any Government control and subsidy, would make the task even a more difficult one. Should that happen, it would mean that the policy pursued by wise local authorities in the planning of new building estates, as in Manchester before the war, will be more generally adopted. That is to say, certain sites for Roman Catholic, Anglican, and Free Church buildings will be apportioned, and there is little doubt that such apportionment will demand the maximum collaboration and joint planning by the Free Churches.

Besides all this, there is a certain heart searching in our own midst about Congregationalism as such. Was the fact that most

of the signatures to the recent Free Church manifesto were those of Congregational ministers and laymen accounted for wholly by a larger charity and breadth of vision? Or did it indicate a certain dissatisfaction, and more general approval of the sentiment occasionally expressed—that there is no longer any need for our special witness? I, personally, am a convinced Congregationalist. I do not say that the untidy and weedy patches in our garden have not sometimes made me look a little enviously at the apparent perfection of our neighbours' plot, but I must confess that closer investigation has reassured me that the seeming perfection of their garden has proved to be an illusion created by the haze of distance. The fact is, we shall never come together in closer unity with our fellow Christians in other Churches by underestimating the value of that truth to which God has called us to bear testimony. After all, as far as I can see, throughout our long story, of whatever else we may have been guilty, we have rarely been guilty of any lack of tolerance. It was not we who closed the Christian pulpit, or set barriers to the Lord's Table, or refused membership in Christ's church to any who profess a sincere discipleship of our Lord.

Because I believe that the concern awakened in me by the problems, challenges, and opportunities of these days is widely shared, I have ventured to set down what appeals to me as being the line which a grand strategy for Congregationalism may follow:—

(1) A re-statement of our Faith in Congregationalism, which, while not closing the doors to the fullest possible collaboration with other Churches to the extent, if the spirit so leads, of unity, will yet declare the relevance of our belief, our specific conviction and witness to our modern needs. Without recognition of these, unity must be for us impossible.

(2) The amplifying of the work of our Survey Committee to result in the publication of a statement declaring our strength and our weakness.

(3) The acknowledgment of the aims of the Reconstruction Fund as an immediate though limited objective.

(4) The setting up of a small committee which, with expert advice, would frame the lines which new building should follow. *E.g.:* A general utility building for school and church use. Design and general size of buildings suitable to our form of worship. Design of the kind of building which could most adequately house the Family Church.

(5) A survey of the real situation of our central churches, in order to discover how our work in city centres could be elaborated and extended. *E.g.:* The maintenance of an effective pulpit ministry; the extension of the services to the community; the provision of a ministry in pastoral psychology.

(6) Investigation into the need and opportunity for an extended ministry of women. There will be many women to whom the war has brought experience in organization, welfare work, *etc.*, who, with a short period of training, like that given at Carey Hall, would be able to render valuable aid to the existing ministry.

(7) The setting up of a Central Board representative of the Free Church denominations whose authority we should be prepared to recognize in a nation-wide development of Free Church work.

(8) In collaboration with the London Missionary Society to found a Ministerial Order, to which men leaving the colleges should be invited. Entrance to involve the taking of certain vows, such as a limited term of celibacy; a readiness to serve wherever they may be sent; willingness to share a "community" or "settlement" life in big centres of population.

Many men voluntarily remain unmarried for two or three years after their entrance into the ministry, and undertake work in missions or in new housing estates, which they could not afford to do were it not for their limited liabilities. At present, these men are often lonely, and left to face, in isolation, difficult problems. To organize this willingness to serve, and to provide for its direction to places where it will be wisely guided and properly sustained, would greatly enrich our churches and our ministry.

The writer of this article has stated his views in no critical spirit, nor with any claim that they are unique, nor even that they are all his own. These ideas are the product of an experience in the ministry (which, though comparatively short, has been, in many ways, intense), of conversations and discussions in which the friction of other minds has kindled sparks of enthusiasm in his own, of a profound love of Congregationalism to which he owes more than he can ever repay, and, above all, of a conviction that the Holy Spirit through the chastisement of adversity, and the constraint of need, and the call of opportunity, is summoning the people called *Congregationalists,* formerly known as *Independents,* to yet greater service for the Kingdom of God.

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS.

This Section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developments in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

CHRISTIAN STRATEGY.

WITH the extension of the war to Africa and then to Russia there has been an increased interest in military strategy. Even those who most dislike war and whose work and interests would seem to be farthest from it often find delight in watching the unfolding of a great strategic move. For are not the principles of strategy true for every sphere and not only the military? Even the Christian Church may learn in the military field lessons for its own strategy. A divided Church must be a weak army. On the other hand the increasing sense of the great world Church may fascinate us with size, mass, and large scale manœuvres at the expense of important small-scale strategy. Perhaps it is not exaggerating to say that the Church is most in danger when it forgets the smallness which compels it to depend on individual initiative and to value the winning of each individual man.

The comparison of guerrilla tactics with the strategy revealed in the Gospels is instructive. T. E. Lawrence in his article in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* on "The Science of Guerrilla Warfare" lays down the principles of guerrilla strategy based on his experience in the Arab Revolt. They are worth recalling. He sums up the essentials for successful rebellion—is that a vulgar word for the Church? "Rebellion", says Lawrence, "must have an unassailable base, something guarded not merely from attack, but from fear of it". For the Arabs it was something intangible, a belief in their cause which could not be assailed.

> It must have a sophisticated alien enemy, in the form of an army of occupation. . . . It must have a friendly population, not actively friendly, but sympathetic to the point of not betraying rebel movements to the enemy. Rebellions can be made by 2 per cent active in a striking force, and 98 per cent passively sympathetic. The few active rebels must have the qualities of speed and endurance, ubiquity and independence of arteries of supply. They must have the technical equipment to destroy or paralyze the enemy's organized communications. . . . In 50 words: Granted mobility, security (in the form of denying targets to the enemy), time, and doctrine (the idea to convert every subject to friendliness), victory will rest with the insurgents, for

the algebraical factors are in the end decisive, and against them perfections of means and spirit struggle quite in vain.

I am not competent to say whether these principles of Lawrence are sound or not from the military point of view. But they bear striking resemblance to the instructions of Jesus when He sent out His disciples in pairs on their special mission. He had been touring the villages, and the work was growing enormously. The population was friendly, though for the most part not active in His cause. His small band of followers was physically in a hopeless position against the might of organized, wealthy ecclesiastical authorities and government and against the weight of tradition. He therefore spread His company, instructing them to travel light, telling them "that they should take nothing for their journey (they must be dependent on friendly people), save a staff only; no scrip, no bread, no money in their purse: but be shod with sandals; and not put on two coats". They were to use the hospitality of the villages as the channel of their evangelism.

Those disciples followed Lawrence's principles in a remarkable way. They had an unassailable base, a belief, "a treasure in heaven where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt", a life unconquerable even by death. They were very conscious of being against "the world", the world that is an alien enemy, sophisticated, disciplined, occupying the territory of human life, a burden on individuals and the community alike. They were up against the great army of worldliness, materialism, secularism, and spiritual anarchy, used with subtle and ruthless power by the devil. But there was a friendly population, for "the common people heard Him gladly". There were only a few of them active. Two per cent exaggerates it. But they travelled light. They had the qualities of speed and endurance, ubiquity when they spread themselves in twos, and independence of arteries. Such weapons as they needed they carried with them. They were not fighting with money or numbers or worldly dignity, but they were always ready with their message, with compassion and service, with the power to heal. Their resources were in God. They could not confront the enemy with his own weapons, but they could strike him with one weapon and strike at his lines of communication. The enemy's power lay in his ability to reach the material and physical, the human and natural possessions of men (things which in themselves are neutral), with the directive force of an evil spirit. The disciples with their one weapon struck behind human possessions when in men's hearts they overcame evil with good.

By ignoring riches, great numbers, human authority and all the other things that most impress ordinary mortals, the disciples were able to strike again and again at the vulnerable spot in the enemy's armament. "Even the devils were subject unto us", they reported.

There is one other point that Lawrence stresses in his account of the Arab Revolt. He was dealing with a number of independent tribes amongst whom there had been conflicts and feuds, jealousies and rivalries. "The Arabs", he says,

> were serving a common ideal, without tribal emulation, and so could not hope for any *esprit de corps*. . . . Any of the Arabs could go home whenever the conviction failed him. Their only contract was honour. Consequently the Arab army had no discipline, in the sense in which it is restrictive, submergent of individuality, the Lowest Common Denominator of men.

It was impossible to mix the Arab tribes, since they disliked or distrusted one another, and could not be used in one another's territory, even

as the denominations of the Church are very sect-conscious. Therefore the Arab war was simple and individual, freshness and variety being gained by the use of each tribe in its own territory. Every enrolled man served in the line of battle and was self-contained. The few Englishmen present controlled by influence and advice, by their superior knowledge, not by an extraneous authority. "In irregular war", says Lawrence,

> if two men are together one is being wasted. . . Here the ideal was to make action a series of single combats, to make the ranks a happy alliance of commanders-in-chief.

I can almost hear the ranks of those stalwart defenders of the priesthood of all believers rise up and cheer. Nor can the closely organized big battalions of the Church afford to undervalue those busy tribes of independent men and women who carry on the guerrilla warfare against evil. The need and desire for reunion in the Church becomes increasingly urgent. But if reunion means levelling the Church down to the Lowest Common Denominator, an important characteristic of the Church, a New Testament feature, will be lost. And because "the wind bloweth where it listeth" there would very soon reappear those independent groups of obstinate and difficult men with initiative and inspiration.

It is urgently important that the Christian Church should be a unity in its work of leavening society, of contending with the great forces of evil and of evangelizing the world. But if in their hurry the promoters of reunion become fascinated with the idea of a closely massed army of Christian worshippers and workers, mechanized into tidy schemes, orders, creeds, synods, and budgets, their haste may provoke just that division in the Church which they are anxious to overcome.

The orthodox commanders of the regular army are apt to look down on guerrilla tactics as eccentric and awkward, if sometimes of temporary value. In modern war they may be right. But can the Church ever hope to be as mightily equipped as the devil in material and human armament—and indeed ought it to be? The greater the worldly structure of the Church the greater the target for the enemy. Its base must be unassailable. It must never be dependent for its greatness and effectiveness upon organization, money, superficial agreement, or numbers. Useful as these things are in their place, necessary as they are up to the existence level, they can easily become the Church's temptation, or in other words weapons of the enemy in the very camp of the Church.

Because it is Christian and strategically urgent, the Church must find a working unity almost at once. Is it impossible to get a general recognition of the necessity, not merely the permissibility, of having several forms of Church life, several methods of attack? Some denominations have been accused of setting too high a standard for the ordinary man, laying upon him a spiritual responsibility he cannot carry. They have answered, that the standard has been lowered by others to a sub-christian level in order to include everyone. Neither is right by itself. Both are right so long as both standards are in existence together. The sect that has imposed a high standard on the individual has found it difficult to find any satisfactory way of forgiving the sinner and receiving him back into the fellowship. It has always been inclined to go apart and not mix with publicans and sinners. On the other hand the sect that has kept its general standard low has been able readily to absolve the sinner and keep him within the bounds of the fellowship; but it has had to struggle largely through segregated groups following a strict rule of life to encourage some individuals to live above the average.

So the division of one-sided emphasis runs right through the Church in worship, in orders, in Church government, and in doctrine. But when all is said and done, when you have fully assessed the value of the big battalions, the guerrilla fighters or any other kind of army, the all-important and last weapon of the Church in her fight against evil, is goodness, love conquering hate, forgiveness forestalling feuds, loving prayer outwitting resentment, deeds of compassion answering deeds of enmity, the peaceful mind surviving the disintegrations and conflicts around. No Church, united or divided, that does not strongly wield that weapon can hope to win the day. But the Church, whether united or a rattling collection of different sects, which does in spite of all confront the world with the startling goodness of Christ will in the end win the day, for against that factor "perfections of means and spirit struggle quite in vain".

F. N. James.

THE CHILDREN IN THE CHURCH.

For many years now in the Free Churches there has been a growing concern about the general decrease in the number of Sunday School scholars. There has also been the disturbing thought in many minds that not all was being done that might be done for the children that do attend, and that sometimes what is being done is irrelevant to the main task of the Church and to the fundamentals of the Faith.

Method and management in the majority of Sunday Schools are a great improvement on a generation ago, but even now, as the writer in a recent Presbyterian pamphlet says:

> There is unhappily no room for doubt that very many of those who have passed through our Sunday Schools have failed to acquire any adequate knowledge of those things "most surely believed" among us. Hence the growing recognition of the need for a catechism. It is significant that all the Free Churches are feeling it—Congregational, Baptist, and Methodist, as well as Presbyterian.

For many ministers, however, the major problem is not in the Sunday School. It lies with the children who attend morning worship. There are those—Dr. George Jackson, I believe, is one of them—who feel that the first part of morning worship during which the children's address is given, achieves little for the children, and interferes seriously with the atmosphere of worship which should obtain. Such a view was shared for many years by the writer, and for two main reasons: he is numbered with those who are "no good at children's addresses"; he was haunted by the thought that many of the stories and "smart little talks", entertaining and morally instructive as they might be, were, nevertheless, altogether beside the point so far as Christian discipleship, churchmanship, and the deep things of the faith are concerned. Admirable as are many of the addresses told and published, how many there are which could quite happily be given by any atheist, agnostic, or anti-Christian moralist who believed that the virtues of kindness, courage, cheerfulness, and mutual-aid are worth preserving.

How to escape from the bondage of custom, however, and what to substitute for the customary children's address, were problems not easy to solve. Finally the decision was made—and with a feeling of relief almost akin to that felt by Christian when the burden dropped from his back and rolled down the hill!—that, despite the fact that the majority of the children who attended morning worship are very young, no more tales and stories should be told. Definite teaching with regard to the Bible, the

Church, the Faith, should be given. If, and when, a story was used, it should be as an illustration only to light up the point at issue.

This syllabus of lessons was drawn up:

The Bible: What it is; Why it is; How it is made up; Why an O.T., and why a N.T.

What its main teaching is (a) about God; (b) about man—boys, girls, men and women; about the world; about life in the world, the pilgrimage through the world, the end of the pilgrimage, and afterwards.

The Bible as the words of God which are to lead us to Jesus, the Word of God, through Whom we come to God as our Loving, Heavenly Father.

Subsequent lessons will be on the main divisions of the Bible: History, Law, Prophecy, and so on, with very careful teaching about Prophets and Prophesying, about which there is still so much confusion and misunderstanding in the minds of our people. The main teaching of the chief books of the O.T., the Gospels, *Acts*, the Epistles.

The material to hand is plentiful; the lessons to be given are legion. The two special days of the Bible—the Jewish Sabbath; the Christian Sunday—the anniversary day every week of the resurrection of Jesus: its meaning and purpose for those who truly love and seek to serve Him.

The Church: not a building, but a company of those who love Jesus, believe certain things about Him, pray to Him, are obedient to Him. We do not "go to Church", we "meet with the Church". Why? What is the purpose? What do we mean when we say that Jesus is the Head of the Church? Why is Jesus our Saviour?

Other lists of lesson are waiting to be arranged and summarized.

By way of variety, lessons on certain Biblical characters are given, and the method of question and answer proves very helpful. Who was the young man who had an adventure with Jesus, several adventures with St. Paul, helped St. Peter, and by helping him gave to the world a very important book? Who was the first person to love and follow Jesus in Europe? A man or a woman? Where did he (she) live, and what happened at his (her) house?

The outstanding festivals of the Christian year will be dealt with before they come round, as well as when they do, and their chief significance taught.

Finally, I hope, it will not be long before the children say together both in morning worship and at Sunday School, what we shall call (for safety's sake!) "A Children's Statement—or Profession—of Faith". It has recently come to the writer's notice that such a Statement is already in use in the Free Church Sunday Schools in the Isle of Wight.

What is set out above does not cover all the ground, nor will it satisfy those who feel that Dogma and Doctrine, Creed and Catechism, should have a prominent place in worship, preaching, and the instruction of the young. It does assure, however, that definite religious instruction is given, that the children are being taught within the worship of the Church the things that appertain to the faith. The main points of each lesson are summed up in a few brief sentences which the children repeat together at least twice. The talk always begins with a brief recapitulation of the previous week's lesson, and one is encouraged by the way the children remember.

And the result. After twelve months the venture is more than justified,

and our early timidities and lack of faith rebuked. The number of scholars attending morning school has slightly increased, and a number of the older scholars now stay for the whole service. Expressions of appreciation have come from quarters where one had half expected frowns or worse. Custom dies hard, and we are a very conservative folk! The confession of one middle-aged, lifelong worshipper is illuminating: "I suppose one should have known all about these things years ago. Anyhow it is refreshing to learn them now!"

With all that is being done, however, we do not forget that "Christianity is caught rather than taught". We do not overlook the fact that to know of Jesus, of the Bible, of the Church, of the Holy Spirit, is only a means to the supreme end of coming to know Him in one's own experience, of loving Him and serving His Kingdom with heart and soul and mind and strength. Nevertheless, we rejoice that the days of feverishly seeking for "tricky little children's addresses" are over; that a part of morning worship that was once a painful custom that had to be observed has become a delightful opportunity to instruct boys and girls in the things that matter most to them, to the Church, and to the Kingdom; and to lead them not only to surrender heart and mind and will to Christ, but to be able also to give an account of the faith that is in them.

W. E. Booth Taylor.

VETERAN TO TYRO.

Many years ago we printed in these pages what we called a pattern letter from a minister declining an invitation to a pastorate, written by R. W. Dale to the church at Clapton Park, London. Recently we stumbled across what seems an equally admirable letter, that of an old minister to his successor, just about to enter on his first pastorate. The writer, E. A. Hytch, had only one church, at Great Harwood, Lancashire, from 1877 to 1912. This letter is dated 21 April, 1913:

> Thank you very much for writing, and for writing so kindly as you have done. You may depend upon my goodwill (if it is needed), and upon my constant prayers on your behalf. You will readily believe that, as long as I am spared, the Church at Gt. Harwood and its Pastor will be constantly remembered in my petitions before the Throne of Grace.
>
> I am, indeed, thankful that you have been led to accept the invitation. There must now be great need of pastoral work, apart from preaching. The people have, according to all I hear, held together wonderfully well; but in every congregation there are some who need looking up. Besides, there are sick people, who need sympathy and help. Having heard you preach, I am satisfied that you are one who will—in the light of modern knowledge and modern needs—preach the Gospel. While we may not use the exact phraseology of our fathers, nor subscribe to every detail of their definitions of doctrine, we do believe and feel that the only hope for the individual or the race is to be found in "the glorious gospel of the blessed God".
>
> You have, I am very pleased to know, far higher qualifications than I ever possessed. And you will have greater advantages by far at Gt. Harwood than I ever had. The premises are now entirely free from debt. I believe I may say, too, that the Church is in a far better condition for spiritual work than it was in 1877. The echoes of a terrible quarrel, which nearly wrecked the Church a few years before, had not altogether died away. Now, so far as I know, the people are

thoroughly united. Then, too, the town is rapidly growing. It may be that the Church will so grow that it may be worth your while to minister there for many years; but this must be left to the future. I am quite sure of this, however, that if a man lives and works as he ought to do, his influence grows as years go by.

Of course, there are the usual foes to the religious life to be met and overcome. The love of pleasure and the love of money still oppose the coming of the Kingdom. The most serious difficulty is that presented by the men. There are a few young men who are thoroughly in earnest; but how few! As you are young, and will probably bring some new views and new methods to the task, it may be that you will be more successful in your efforts for their good than I have been.

You speak of the possibility of making mistakes; that is so with all of us. But I think that people are tolerant of honest mistakes; if they see that you really are trying to do good, and to do them good, they will forgive occasional errors. They will not, however, forgive indolence, self-seeking, or neglect of manifest duty.

"Take heed to thyself"; I may be permitted to quote the words of the Apostle; personal character first; for it is, indeed, the chief thing. Then—"and to the teaching".

With every wish for your best and highest welfare, I remain,

Yours sincerely,

E. A. Hytch.

ON LIFE AND BOOKS.

"PROUD TO BE CONTEMPORARY WITH".

In one of his letters F. J. A. Hort speaks of Darwin's *Origin of Species* as "a book one is proud to be contemporary with". This set me wondering about our own times. Are there any such books in this generation, any such people? Is it not true that we live in an age of sublime mediocrity? The trouble is that mediocrity has a derogatory sound about it which is etymologically altogether undeserved. The prayer "Make no more giants, Lord, but elevate the race" has been abundantly answered in both its component parts, for it is true that the general level is higher even if there are no outstanding peaks. And having seen where the Carlylean worship of heroes, the Nietzschean cult of the superman, may lead the world, we are not likely to crave for giants.

It is trite to say that we no longer have the great figures which marked the Victorian age to which Hort belonged. Where are the preachers of the calibre of Parker, Spurgeon, and McLaren, where in our denomination such scholars as Dale and Fairbairn? Art, music, drama, tell the same story. And politics—for would anybody compare our present politicians with Gladstone and Disraeli, Bright and Cobden? Of course, as an exception there is Mr, Churchill, but his pre-eminence only reveals the flatness of the surrounding country. Where would a successor be found if one should—*absit omen*—be needed? The adulation of the Prime Minister by his Cabinet does not make us regard them more highly, more happily, or more hopefully.

But this article is about books, and not politics. The Victorians had much they could be "proud to be contemporary with". Am I becoming merely a *laudator temporis acti*? I think not, when I remember Dickens and Thackeray; Carlyle and Ruskin; Browning and Tennyson; George Eliot and Charlotte Brontë, Elizabeth Barrett and Elizabeth Gaskell. I look round the world of letters today and I search for anything which will assuredly be a κτῆμα ἐς ἀεί. Will you help to find one? Here is the question: write down any book written in the 20th century—theology, science, history, biography, fiction, drama—which has had a decisive influence on the life of the people, or which will affect for all time its own field, or even any book which you think will be read a hundred years hence. Does *Mein Kampf* stand alone?

How many Gifford Lectures, hailed as great pronouncements in their time, do you remember? Where is the 20th century Paley? But having sold many *tons* of obsolete theology at waste paper prices I am ill inclined to search for permanence in contributions to the queen of the sciences!

A book like Streeter's *The Four Gospels*, which marks the end of a phase of study in the Synoptic problem, may last, or one of the pioneers of Form Criticism if that method can hold its ground; but with all our able expositors is there any work which stands for its generation as did George Adam Smith's *Isaiah* or Sanday and Headlam's *Romans*? And neither Oxford nor Cambridge, despite the latter's pretensions, can give us today such a triumvirate as Lightfoot, Westcott, and Hort.

In the world of science Einstein may leave his mark, and Eddington

and Jeans in this country, Millikan in America, find a place in a foot-note a hundred years hence. But this is rushing in where angels fear to tread, and I return to firmer ground.

Since Firth's continuation of Gardiner, and the *Political History of England* and the Oxford *History of England* what has there been in the field of history likely to survive? Competent work in abundance, here as elsewhere, for I am not one of those who think the times culturally decadent. Reading hundreds of books a year, I marvel at the general high standard; it is because there is so much in every field that is able and workmanlike that the absence of the truly great is so striking. Some of Dr. Coulton's work on the medieval period will, I think, stand the test of time, and so may Mr. Churchill's *Marlborough* and Dr. G. M. Trevelyan's books on the *Risorgimento,* in the latter cases style proving a considerable help to survival.

What are the chances of other writers—Chesterton, who used to delight and dazzle, Belloc, who has his fervent champions, for example? Will they be read in 2041? It seems unlikely. Some of Mr. Wells's earliest writings may be, and some of Mr. Shaw's plays, notably *St. Joan;* Walpole's Herries and Galsworthy's Forsyte sagas have more than a good chance, and Arnold Bennett's *Old Wives' Tale* and Mr. Priestley's *Good Companions* outsiders'. And some of Kipling's stories will probably live, for he was almost alone in his field at the start. Among the women Mary Webb and Constance Holme are possibles, though Virginia Woolf and Miss Gertrude Steen will probably find speedy oblivion. It is indeed amazing how soon this happens. Somewhere in the pages of this journal will be found a confident prophecy, written maybe ten to twelve years ago, that in twenty years D. H. Lawrence, then hailed as one of the major stars in the firmament of English literature, would be heard of only in University classrooms. How rarely is he mentioned today even there!

In poetry *The Testament of Beauty* will, I think, for long make its appeal, though only to the few, but there is little hope for our moderns, with their metrical vagaries and their economic obsessions. If Mr. T. S. Eliot survives it will be in *Murder in the Cathedral* rather than in the confused and murky poems which have made him a cult—perhaps even the last sentence should read "once" for "have".

Why is it that our age is so poor in great men and great writing compared with a century ago? Do men and women write down to the demi-semi-educated mass, and so give less than their best? Is the demand for excitement, thrillers, crime stories so seductive that genius turns to them? And will they live? Will Lord Peter Wimsey and Hercule Poirot and the rest of them be known fifty years hence as Sherlock Holmes is today? I have my doubts. And while I know John Buchan's Richard Hannay series almost by heart—*The Thirty-nine Steps, Greenmantle, Mr. Standfast,* and *The Three Hostages*—somehow I think they will scarcely have the long life of *Robinson Crusoe,* though I cannot see why they should not.

Are there any books in the sphere of politics and economics corresponding to *Das Kapital* or Bryce's *American Commonwealth*? Mr. Maynard Keynes's *Economic Consequences of the Peace* was important, and will always be there for historians of the War and its aftermath, but the bulky apologies of participants will, in the main, find a place in the pulping machines of the next generation. Perhaps Mr. Lionel Curtis's *Civitas Dei* or Mr. Clarence Streit's *Union Now* will prove books to which men look back because they started mankind on a new journey.

Many who read these pages are writers of books, more have ambitions to write—maybe to write books that will make their mark. How is

success to be achieved? Much depends on the nature of the desire? If the hope is to write a best-seller, I can offer no recipe—that depends on a concatenation of circumstances, the time, the place, and the loved one together, as it were. Nobody has yet understood why one novel sells by the tens of thousands, and a dozen, equally good, published at the same time, fail to catch on.

But if the aspirant is less mercenary and more modest, perhaps suggestions based on an individual's experience are possible. Find a field, however small, which has never been profitably worked, and work at it until you are certain no more is there to be found. Then your contribution may fill a niche that has long been empty. Do a solid, sterling, piece of work that will not need to be done again—like the Rev. A. G. Matthews's *Calamy Revised,* and you will have earned a night's repose.

As a periodical journalist I have written much that is ephemeral, but there are tiny nuggets here and there—a calendar of documents, a history or two, maybe even a biography—that I humbly hope may be found of service to scholars a generation hence. This means, of course, that for most of us the question is not of writing books "proud to be contemporary with", but rather of polishing one's own bit of stone in the hope it may fit not unworthily into the vast temple of learning.

If survival is what is to be desired, then attention must be paid to the nature of the work undertaken: Cruden lived a long time ago, and preachers will always be indebted to James Hastings; even if you only edit an almanack your name may survive if it be Whitaker or Wisden; Dr. Moffatt's translation of the Bible will no doubt be read when there are only half-a-dozen Free Church Theological Colleges in the land (an achievement which will take a century) and Dr. Souter's Greek text of the *N.T.* still be indispensable. Many, it is to be feared, fritter away on the purely ephemeral time and opportunity which might have prepared a lasting memorial. Few, like Milton, discover at 23 that time is the subtle thief of youth, and perhaps it is not until middle life that a man hears at his back, like Milton's contemporary, "time's wingèd chariot hurrying near". A distinguished historian remarked to me recently that *two* wars in a generation were too many for a historian; but even without the waste of war time passes swiftly.

It has been suggested that some books are of a nature which ensures their permanence. Two such have just been published by the Presses of the older Universities, which are admirably fulfilling their function in these days.

Mr. George Sampson's *Concise Cambridge History of English Literature* (15s.) is not merely an epitome in 1,000 or so pages of the 14 volumes of the larger *History;* it has an identity of its own imposed by the writer's personality. Sometimes Mr. Sampson is fierce, for he has strong prejudices ("*The Passing of the Third Floor Back* . . . wasted for years, in suburban and provincial theatres, the great gifts of Forbes Robertson"); sometimes, as in saying Mr. Shaw's Joan never comes alive, he is as far wrong as he can be. There are omissions, too—Constance Holme is an example—and the perspective is often wrong as when the halfpenny obscures the sun: Henry James has three pages, and four, more than to Macaulay, are given to that precious *poseur,* George Moore. The three excellent pages on Mr. T. S. Eliot include much else, and are not too many; Hugh Walpole gets half a page only. Often, as on James Joyce and D. H. Lawrence, Mr. Sampson says the right things in the right way. The miscellaneous sections, even those on grammar and the growth of language, are readable, and the Conclusion at once searching and stimulating. These comments

are only to underline the statement that the volume is not merely a compilation. It lives in its own right, and will constantly be found useful

With Mr. Sampson I have already spent many pleasant hours, as I have also with the new *Oxford Dictionary of Quotations* (25s.). I shudder to think, however, what will happen when this volume is let loose among the preachers. Having often been told that a sermon invariably loses intensity when a quotation begins—a dictum I invariably reject, despite the measure of truth in it—I pity the fate of long-suffering congregations when a catena of even excellent quotations is thrown at them and labelled a sermon.

Everything—or almost everything—is here, as the marvellously full and accurate Index reveals. Once when I thought I had caught the compilers napping—Burke's description of the colonies held by ties "though light as air, are strong as links of iron"—the quotation appeared in the Addenda. I missed Queen Elizabeth's "I am a barren stock" and Byron's "They never fail who die in a great cause", and Charlotte Brontë is rather scurvily treated; but the causes for complaint are slight indeed.

Few readers of these pages will be able to think of familiar quotations and find them missing. 14 pages from the Book of Common Prayer, 30 from the Bible; a rich section of Anonymous; Ballads; Nursery Rhymes; *Punch;* and a foreign section which includes *Sturm und Drang, Blut und Eisen, E pur si muove, une nation de boutiquiers,* and all the others you can think of added to the feast. As a cocktail there is a delightful essay by Mr. Bernard Darwin. And as I began with a Darwin, so will I end—this *Oxford Dictionary of Quotations* is certainly a volume with which one is pleased as well as proud to be contemporary.

ALBERT PEEL.

WORTH NOTING FROM RECENT BOOKS.

It is increased knowledge of nature which has made supra-nature incredible, or at least difficult of belief. We measure the change from the standpoint of the supernatural and we call it irreligious. Possibly if we measured it from the standpoint of the natural piety it is fostering, the sense of the permanent and inevitable implication of nature and man in a common career and destiny, it would appear as the growth of religion. We take note of the decay of cohesion and influence among the religiously organized bodies of the familiar historic type, and again we conventionally judge religion to be on the decrease. But it may be that their decadence is the fruit of a broader and more catholic principle of human intercourse and association which is too religious to tolerate these pretensions to monopolize truth and to make private possessions of spiritual insight and aspiration.

John Dewey, *Education Today.*

. . . we all in varying degree bring such disordered and uninstructed minds to worship that we are quick to twist everything in a subjective direction and to judge even the most clean and objective ritual, not by the degree in which it confronts us with the reality of the divine nature and will, but by the degree in which it gives us feelings of an expansive and pleasant kind. No doubt it is sometimes only poverty of language which makes our first comment that we *enjoyed* a service, and not "I saw the Lord high and lifted up; woe is me! I am a man of unclean lips". No doubt we have all felt qualms in using the word or in hearing it used, but many I fear do not feel any qualms at all. The supreme test for them really is whether they have found the hour in church enjoyable, whether the music being good, the singing hearty, the decorations no offence to the eye, the curtains the right shade, the building beautiful, they come away "feeling" better. The sense that truth, saving truth, the truth that liberates, is at once infinitely valuable and infinitely difficult to come by for our sin-darkened minds is almost completely absent. I have sometimes caught myself wondering whether aspirin would not have served just as well.

H. H. Farmer, *The Servant of the Word.*

There is an evil which is the result of ignorance. And it can be conquered by the forces of education and gracious unselfishness. There is an evil which is conscious and deliberate and deeply personal. You cannot conquer that evil by asserting the moral invincibility of the friendly smile.

Jesus knew that while men could accept Him, they could also reject Him. . . . He wanted to meet men as a friend. He went to the cross to prove His friendship. But if men in the awful strength of their personal power rejected His friendship, the men who refused to have Him as a friend *would have to meet Him as a judge.*

Lynn Harold Hough, *The Christian Criticism of Life.*

Hitler and his conspirators are threatening to rob every institution of its own nature. They are occupied in destroying that rich variegation through which Christian Europe created a culture that put Egypt, Hellas, and Rome in the shade. Their hands try to violate the embroidery of God into which the cross has been worked. England must not be England; the Netherlands must not be the Netherlands; Oxford not Oxford; the church

no church, the trade unions no trade unions, the family no natural love context; trade no working community of free men. Every variegation must be killed. With the power of the war-machine and the Gestapo they try to convert everything, nothing excepted, into one military army of slaves that works for the Herrenvolk.

P. S. GERBRANDY, *The Contribution of the Churches to the Reconstruction of Europe.*

Religion must be carried to a further stage than obtained in either primary form of Christianity. It must be de-ecclesiasticized, made spiritually pure and effective. In an address in 1907 he [Masaryk] said:

> We must unchurch all our life. . . . Religion must be separated from the Church and I am sure from all the churches. . . . We have to overcome Catholicism in our hearts. . . . We need a constructive, a creative religious liberty. We not only must have religion, we must have a higher and more ennobling religion. . . . We want positive progress in religion, we want a religious life which will overcome all the ecclesiastical forms of religion.

W. PRESTON WARREN, *Masaryk's Democracy.*

The point is that though a Christian may fast like a Manichee, or feel like a Manichee, or grouse at greater length than a Manichee ever would, he must never *think* like a Manichee. He must never erect his dark unhappy feelings into a dark unhappy interpretation of God's world. If he does that he has apostatized from Christianity. For the foundation of Christianity is the great truth of reason, that underlying our fragmentary experience there is a Self-subsistent Being who is Perfect to an Infinite degree. God is Perfect in wisdom, goodness and power, All-mighty, All-good and All-wise. It is the rational element in Christianity, its philosophy and still more its theology, which stands between the hard-pressed Christian and surrender to despair.

MARGARET T. MONRO, *Seeking for Trouble.*

It is thus a fundamental disloyalty for Christians to try to be a select society for the virtuous. Only persecution justifies them in being that, even for a time. Wherever Christians are free, their first duty is to be a society of lost and found, good and bad, rubbing shoulders without passing remarks, and this simply the more effectively to seek and save that which is lost. Unpersecuted Christianity, if it keeps itself free of the contaminating presence of the ill-conducted, very quickly subsides into Pharisaism.

MARGARET T. MONRO, *Seeking for Trouble.*

FOREIGN IMPRESSIONS.

SWEDISH CONGREGATIONALISTS.

DR. DOUGLAS HORTON writes from the United States:

> We are quite familiar with the Swedish Congregationalists in this country, for they have a number of churches here. We work hand in glove with them in the East and are doing so more and more in the Middle West. Before the war we were also in touch with them, curiously enough, through the Congregational churches in Czechoslovakia, which are rather closer to them theologically than we. They are a conservative, highly evangelistic group.

Of Sweden, Mr. Björn Hallström, the London Editor of the *Svenska Morgonbladet,* writes he is endeavouring to obtain information from the *Svenska Missionsförbundet,* of Stockholm, whose Secretary is the Rev. G. Palmer. Until the War this Foreign Missionary Society associated with the Free Church group maintained in Sunderland a Swedish Seamen's Free Church open to sailors of all Free Church denominations (there were also six Lutheran Churches for Swedish sailors in Britain). Mr. Hallström welcomes our interest in the Swedish Free Churches, for he says they

> have recently declared that their "eyes are directed westwards", and proclaimed their solidarity with the Free Churches of Great Britain and America.

The Rev. Alexander McLeish, of *World Dominion,* who has paid several visits to the Society mentioned, writes:

> The situation is very confused from our point of view. The Free Church groups who go under the name of the Swedish Missionary Society, founded in 1878, might be called Congregational in the sense that the Free Church Movement during a time of revival founded Churches of its own, which, however, never were separated from the Church of Sweden. In fact, a provision under Swedish law makes it possible for Free Church groups to organize Churches of their own while still remaining Lutheran. Dr. Palmer and others there were always more interested in explaining to one that they were Lutheran first and then only Free Church. I doubt whether they understand by the term Congregational what we mean by that word, it being rather that these congregations organized later are separate from the parish administration of the Lutheran Church. Hence I should think they would not claim to be a part of the Congregational Church, say of all Europe, if there was such a thing.
>
> There are differences within the ranks of these Free Church Societies, for example, the Baptists have two groups amounting to 73,000, the Methodist Episcopal under an American Bishop, are also so classed. The Pentecostals and Adventists also have not severed their nominal connection with the Lutheran Church. I think, however, that Dr. Rushbrooke includes in his list of European Baptists those who are affiliated to the Church of Sweden and are Lutheran in all except that they believe in adult baptism.
>
> The Swedish Society has a membership of about 200,000. In addition to this there is another group called the Orebro Missionary Association which might be called Congregational in the above sense, but is really Baptist and strongly fundamentalist. It, however, has somewhat under 2,000 members.
>
> I think that this explains the reason why so little has been heard of them in this country, for they would not dream, I think, of being classed as denominational. Our Swedish friend in referring to the fact that there are so many "Congregational" Churches I think did not use the term in the same sense as we do.
>
> I am sorry I cannot tell you how they manage to integrate the Free Church groups in the National Church of Sweden or into the parish system. I was mainly interested in the foreign mission side of their work and did not enquire much into its Swedish organization. It would be interesting, however, to discover how they do it, as it might offer a useful precedent for a kind of Church Union that seems to function very well in Sweden.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

"Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—FRANCIS BACON.

"A good book is the precious life-blood of a master-spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.

(*The place of publication is London unless otherwise stated.*)

The Christian Criticism of Life. By LYNN HAROLD HOUGH. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. $2.50.

The personal reminiscence with which Dean Hough opens his chapter on Irving Babbitt encourages another one. In 1928 we were staying in Detroit with that most delightful of hosts, Dr. Chester B. Emerson, now Dean of Cleveland Cathedral, and among other things lectured for Dr. Hough in the Central Methodist Church. During our stay we were invited to a luncheon given by the churches to Dr. Hough and to Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, who were both about to leave the city. On arrival we were asked to speak, but naturally declined, for the programme was all arranged, and the large gathering had assembled to hear those who were to voice its appreciation of the distinguished services the guests of honour had rendered. Against our will it was decided that we should at any rate be introduced to the assembly, though we insisted that the only response would be a silent bow. The Chairman happened to be a Baptist who didn't know the British intruder from Adam, though when the time came he did his best with only occasional glances at the little brief which had been prepared for him. After the responsive bow, however, he rose again with the words, "Now we've got that out of the way . . . " and to his surprise got the best laugh of his speech.

Since those days much water has run under the bridge, and the ways of the two divines to whom Detroit that day said farewell have diverged, and in more senses than one. With Dr. Niebuhr probably other pages of this issue will be concerned. Dr. Hough is now Dean of Drew Theological Seminary, and into this new book he has garnered the rich fruits of his wide reading and long meditation. His Fernley Lecture, *Evangelical Humanism,* has long been known in this country for its sound and thorough examination of its theme: the new work gives to the old both background and development; and in its spacious range, its able interpretation, and its aptness of phrase it is Dean Hough at his best.

A survey of humanism—and the humanists are those who "have a steady vision of a world of intelligence controlling the world of impulse for high ends"—from Greece to the machine age, leads to an examination of life on its three levels, the sub-human, the human (here one of the best chapters in the book, "Nontheistic Humanism" is introduced), and the spiritual, which logically includes not merely theism, or even "Christian humanism", but the evangelical humanism at the centre of which stands the Cross of Christ. The later stages of the discussion are illuminated by expositions of the teaching of Irving Babbitt, who remained on the second level, and Paul Elmer More, who was led step by step to the third.

The whole is a brilliant description of man's development until he reaches Christian humanism, "man under God controlling nature". It contains some fine writing, notably (210) a panegyric on the Christian

Church (which, we fear, will constrain some readers to ask whether the present tense could be used of these achievements lauded in the past) and a summary of the glories of the 13th century (72-3) which we wish we had space to quote. But here are some of Dean Hough's sentences:

> God's immanence is not the absence of intelligence. It is the perpetual and exhaustless exercise of conscious intelligence.
>
> He [Babbitt] never denied that democracy must justify itself at last by producing the aristocratic virtues.
>
> You are looking upon a people [in the New England "Indian Summer"] whose memories have become greater than their hopes.
>
> They [the pantheists] build a tomb at the end of the human enterprise and call it the ultimate peace.

These samples will, we trust, whet the appetite of the reader for a notable book, in which all can find stimulus and ministers scores of sermons.

This summary will indicate the satisfying nature of the argument:

> You cannot understand nature without man.
> You cannot understand man without God.
> You cannot understand God without Christ.
> You cannot understand Christ without the cross.
> You cannot understand Christianity without seeing man controlling nature and worshipping and obeying the God he meets in Jesus Christ, as love on the cross and judgment on the throne.

EDITOR.

Stages on Life's Way. By S. KIERKEGAARD. Translated by W. Lowrie, D.D. Oxford Press. 30s.

After all that has been written in these pages we shall not be accused of depreciating either Kierkegaard's genius or Dr. Lowrie's industry. But as many a poet of note must deplore the zeal of devotees who discover and print early poems he thought had found oblivion, so we cannot but regret that Dr. Lowrie has deemed it wise to translate the works in this volume. They occupy, with the Appendix, over 460 pages (and, in our copy, as if that were not enough, one sheet is duplicated). Little wonder that on p. 437 Kierkegaard begins his conclusion "My dear reader! But to whom am I speaking? There is perhaps not a single reader left". Possibly, for the whole volume is concerned with Kierkegaard's disastrous love affair, and we begin to curse the day he first saw Regina. We have first *"In Vino Veritas"*, a banquet in which the subject of love is discussed, then "Various Observations about Marriage", in which the writer poses as a married man, and then "Guilty?"/"Not Guilty?", described as "A passion narrative, a psychology experiment", in which Frater Taciturnus prints and discusses "Quidam's Diary", which itself occupies nearly 200 pages. In this diary Kierkegaard examines, analyses, dissects his melancholy and harassed soul as he loves, becomes engaged to, and breaks his engagement to, Regina. Added to the ordinary torment love brings to a young man, there is Kierkegaard's peculiar nature, and his scruples about his own past and his father's, about all which we have already learnt more than enough. And what are we to think of a man who, walking with a friend who does not know his *fiancée*, remarks as she approaches, "How suffering the girl looks!", and getting the reply, "It doesn't seem to me so at all" engages in argument on the subject?

EDITOR.

The Fourth Gospel: its significance and environment. By R. H. STRACHAN. S.C.M. 10s. 6d.

The brevity of this notice is in inverse ratio to the importance of this book, for whose appearance many have waited as "they that watch for the morning". It is the amplification of a smaller and much appreciated study, in the light of almost a quarter of a century's further research and meditation. On a first inspection I fancy I detect a slight swing to the "right" from the earlier volume, in line with Dr. Strachan's abandonment of dislocation and of redactorial suggestions. Yet nothing could be better than his handling of the Lazarus story or his additional notes on "glory" and "truth". He has an ingenious defence of "water" in the much discussed 3^5, which some scholars would still with 6^{51b-58} ascribe to ecclesiastical editing. The whole book is illumined by illustrative quotations from, and references to, a wide range of literature, and altogether offers a most profitable investment for half a guinea. It is strange, however, to find no reference to the work of B. W. Bacon, or to W. (not T. W.) Manson's great little book, *The Incarnate Glory*. Nor does there appear to be mention of the Rylands papyrus fragment which witnesses to the early date of the Gospel.

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

The Nature and Destiny of Man. By REINHOLD NIEBUHR. Nisbet. 15s.

Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr is becoming almost as well known and as much sought after in this country as he is in America. He is deservedly regarded by many as a prophet who has a real word of God to mediate to his day and generation. This appreciation will certainly be enhanced by his Edinburgh Gifford Lectures, the first part of which, under the title "Human Nature", has now been issued. It is a keen and comprehensive study of man's nature and personality—of man in all his relations with himself, the world, his fellows, and God. But it remains a torso, only half the story being told. The second volume on "Man's Destiny and the way of his Salvation" is needed to complete it, and until it appears judgment on the first can be only provisional.

Dr. Niebuhr states in his preface his "conviction that there are resources in the Christian faith for an understanding of human nature which have been lost in modern culture". Hence his book falls naturally into two parts, the first of which criticizes the non-Christian theories of man, summed up as naturalism, idealism, and romanticism, and the second gives a dogmatic presentation of the Christian point of view as Dr. Niebuhr sees it. The modern view of man combines in itself the defects of all these non-Christian theories. It issues in a bourgeois individualism which is free and sufficient unto itself. It has its roots "not only in the Platonism and neo-Platonism in which it first expressed itself, but also in the later naturalism of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries". As over against this bourgeois individualism with its pagan origins Dr. Niebuhr sets the Christian point of view:

> Without the presuppositions of the Christian faith the individual is either nothing or becomes everything. In the Christian faith man's insignificance as a creature, involved in the process of nature and time, is lifted into significance by the mercy and power of God in which his life is sustained.

The whole critical treatment of modern man, with his bourgeois civilization, his easy conscience, and optimistic idealism, contains many home truths and makes a fascinating study. There is no hope for man that way.

The romantic pessimism which culminates in Freud may be regarded

as symbolic of the despair which modern man feels when his optimistic illusions are dispelled: for under the perpetual smile of modernity there is a grimace of disillusion and cynicism.

The only way out is the Christian way, and this comes by direct revelation of God.

Man does not know himself truly except as he knows himself confronted by God. Only in that confrontation does he become aware of his full stature and freedom and of the evil in him.

Man is made by God and for God and in the image of God. Therefore he is forlorn, anxious, and ineffective without God. But he is also a sinner, corrupt, alienated from God, and a rebel. This problem of sin takes up nearly the whole of the latter half of Dr. Niebuhr's book. His discussion of it may be summed up as a fine defence and restatement of "the distinctively Christian doctrine that sin has its source not in temporality but in man's wilful refusal to acknowledge the finite and determinate character of his existence".

This is a powerful and brilliant book, full of insight and instinct with faith and hope. None the less it is open to criticism. The treatment of non-Christian systems is superficial and sometimes one-sided. Classical thought, Hellenism in all its phases, and the humanism of the Renaissance are criticized and condemned more severely than they deserve. There is a tendency to over-simplification, as when idealism is practically identified with rationalism and romanticism with vitalism. Terms like Biblical religion and Biblical faith are frequently used as though they were homogeneous, when simply Christianity is meant. There are defects, too, in Dr. Niebuhr's psychology. His theory of personality is not very coherent, and there is frequent confusion between individualism, individuality, and personality. The use of the epithet bourgeois to characterize culture, civilization, individualism, and even rationalism is irritating, for Dr. Niebuhr never explains just what he means by it. Like so many moderns, too, Dr. Niebuhr is more concerned with the origin of sin and evil than with its overcoming, with the cause rather than with the cure. But surely in "Biblical religion", with its gospel of free forgiveness, the emphasis is all the other way. These, however, are but small blemishes in a really great book. They do not affect seriously its main argument, which is a fine vindication of the Christian view of man made in the image of God but also a sinner needing salvation.

W. B. Selbie.

The Psycho-Analytic Method and the Doctrine of Freud. By Roland Dalbiez. Longmans. 2 vols. 40s.

It is perhaps too early as yet to give any just or final estimate on the value and significance of the contribution made by Sigmund Freud to the study of human nature and behaviour. But it is quite natural that an attempt should be made, for there can be no question as to the importance and originality of his work. "the most profound analysis that history has ever known of the less human elements in human nature". But Freud has been so frequently misinterpreted by enthusiastic admirers and by bitter opponents, that any balanced and unprejudiced attempt to explain him is welcome. Such an attempt has been made by Dr. Roland Dalbiez, and his work takes rank at once among the more important contributions to the study of psycho-analysis from the standpoint of one who is himself not a Freudian.

The book appears in two closely packed volumes. The first of them is devoted to setting forth or expounding the Freudian position; and the second

to discussion and criticism of it. This distinction, however, is frequently not maintained. There is at least implied criticism in the first volume and some further discussion in the second, and therefore a good deal of repetition. But it all serves to illustrate Dr. Dalbiez's general contention as to the necessity of drawing a sharp distinction between the psycho-analytic method and the empirical facts it discloses and the doctrines developed from it. Dr. Dalbiez is a philosopher as well as a psychologist, and, as Dr. E. B. Strauss says in a brief introduction to the book, "insists on treating what is psychological in accordance with the requirements of scientific psychology and demands a rigid philosophical methodology where philosophy is involved".

The subject-matter of the first volume is Freud's Psychopathology of Every day Life, his Theories of Dreams and Sex, of the various Neuroses and Psychoses, and of Morals and Religion. The exposition is by no means confined to Freud himself, but is illustrated from the case-books of many psychiatrists, notably the American Frink. There are, however, some curious omissions. No mention whatever is made of McDougall or of William Brown, both of whom have made real contributions to the subject. In the second volume much of the same ground is covered, but from a more critical standpoint. The Freudian theories of the Unconscious, of Sexology, of Morbid Psychic Causality, and of the relation of Psycho-analysis to the Spiritual Life, come under close investigation. The general conclusions arrived at are those which are already familiar to students of the subject. Dr. Dalbiez severely criticizes Freud's obsession with sexuality, his over-emphasis on the abnormal and psycho-pathic, his lack of a metaphysic or philosophy, and his judgment of all spiritual values from the standpoint of evolutionary empiricism. His general conclusion is:

> Psycho-analytical investigation does not explain the philosophical aspect of philosophy, the artistic aspect of art, the scientific aspect of science, the moral aspect of morality, or the religious aspect of religion. The specific nature of the spiritual values eludes the instrument of investigation which Freud's genius has created. Psycho-analysis leaves the fundamental problems of the human soul where it found them.

The book has been well translated from the French by T. F. Lindsay and is thoroughly readable.

W. B. SELBIE.

Lessons of the Prince of Peace. By C. E. RAVEN, D.D. Longmans. 2s. 6d.

This, the Bishop of London's Lent Book, is a little book, but a great one. Its six chapter-titles are as follows:—Of Sensitiveness: Christ Calls; Of Service: Christ Constrains; Of Loyalty: Christ Converts; Of Fellowship: Christ Unites; Of Failure: Christ Demands; Of Success: Christ Fulfils. It reads somewhat awkwardly, almost as if it had been taken down from thinking aloud (we have "Britains" for "Britons" on p. 82), but it possesses throughout the stimulus of a mind which refuses to accept either its thinking or its feeling at second hand.

Dr. Raven regards much current eschatological teaching as a concession to the defeatism of the times, and pleads for evangelism "rather by proclaiming God's glory than by denouncing human sin", starting "our doctrine from the Creation not the Fall". British Christianity he sees as privileged "to stand midway between the transcendental and often pietistic tendencies of Continental Christianity and the humanism and practicality of America". Christian morality he describes as "a matter of personal

contact, of the *rapport* of friend with friend, of the simple fact that in His presence I cannot do the thing that outrages or ignores Him''. If the Church fails ''to foster saintliness, to overcome evil, to heal disease, to promote reconciliation'', ''no orthodoxy of credal profession, no apostolic succession of bishops, no ordered ministry of word and sacraments can save it from its Master's condemnation of the whited sepulchre''. Dr. Raven shows how Christians, like the first disciples, have to go ''down into the hell of self-discovery and self-contempt, and in the furnace of disillusionment and despair . . . find that God was not frustrate but triumphant, and Christ not defeated but signally and gloriously triumphant''. Then, ''with the discovery (or gift) of Christ comes also a discovery of all else as well'', as we come ''to observe for the first time the unbelievable beauty and interest of the world, to perceive afresh the worth and pathos of mankind''. These quotations are meant as signposts to the argument of the six chapters. Following are a few out of many striking phrases:

> how unseemly it is to treat God as a nurse or His Church as an ambulance.
>
> When I talk of a Christian, I mean one with whom to see is to act (this from John Oman).
>
> They are meek, and therefore dauntless, unbreakable.
>
> even the strictest science is now beginning to discover that we cannot renounce anthropomorphism.
>
> Self-reliance and self-reverence, self-knowledge and self-control have dominated our education, our citizenship, our religion, ever since the days of imperial Rome: . . . To find God in Christ would be to recover from this distortion.
>
> He would not fight—not because it was useless, but because it was evil.
>
> the ultimate invincibility of the love that is stripped stark naked of every security.
>
> It has never been clear how Christianity survived the disappointment of this hope (of the end of the world).
>
> one of the supreme creations of the Christ, the art of riding loose to life which is the secret of romance.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism: 1865-1915. By CHARLES HOWARD HOPKINS. Yale and Oxford Presses. 18s. 6d.

In his preface, Professor Hopkins declares that ''there are not a few interpretations of the uniquely American movement toward the socializing and ethicizing of Protestantism known as 'the social gospel', but heretofore no adequate history has been available''. It may be said at once that this gap in our knowledge is now filled (at least for the period under discussion) by this admirable presentation of the subject. Taking its rise as a thesis for the Ph.D. degree of Yale University, it is a mine of exact and meticulously documented information on ideas, men, and movements connected with the social interpretation and application of the Christian gospel during the flowering period of 1865-1915 in America. Together with the classified bibliography for the study of social Christianity which the author is already preparing, the present volume must put all future students of the subject in Professor Hopkins' debt.

The social gospel with which the book deals is defined as ''American Protestantism's response to the challenge of modern industrial society''.

The development of this response is traced from the earliest faint stirrings of deep concern among the enlightened few who had prophetic insight into the mounting problems of post-Civil War industrial development until, in the early years of the present century, the response of the churches was organized in their various departments for social action; while the final chapter of the story (prior to an excellent summing up in the Conclusion) tells how the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America not only showed deep concern for the social aspects of the faith, but was indeed partly brought into being as a direct result of this great development during 1865-1915.

Stressing the fact throughout that "the social gospel was the reaction of Protestantism—markedly stimulated by socialism—to the ethics and practices of capitalism as brought to point in the industrial situation", Professor Hopkins proves this thesis by careful and critical use of contemporary evidence, to obtain which he has ranged over books, speeches, manifestos, conference reports, magazines, and newspapers with endless care and patience. The major figures such as Washington Gladden, W. D. P. Bless, Walter Rauschenbusch stand out clearly, but the lesser known workers are fully acknowledged, just as slum dwellings, gambling, temperance, and other smaller problems allied to the main theme have sufficient mention; and always, whether it be ideas, men or movements, the ample footnotes indicate further sources of information for the curious.

Naturally, in an American book, there are a few words and phrases which fall strangely on English ears, and (what is of more importance) the word "socialism" is used in a disconcerting manner to include all shades of opinion from "pale pink to Russian red". Due allowance must be made for the style of a book which attempts to compile a large proportion of its paragraphs almost entirely from quotations; what some will find harder to bear is the unfortunate phrasing of certain ideas, as for example (p. 55), "To the left of this middle-of-the-road viewpoint the acids of modernity fomented . . . ".

Finally, this book raises two allied questions which, though Professor Hopkins may not have felt them relevant to this volume, would nevertheless make a valuable study, *viz.*, the results of the social emphasis of American Protestantism in the period under discussion; and the relationship between the social gospel and the general trend of American social history.

S. Myers.

English Cathedral Music. From Edward VI to Edward VII. By Edmund H. Fellowes, M.V.O., M.A., Mus.Doc. Methuen. 16s.

Everyone who has read Dr. Fellowes' *William Byrd*, or is acquainted with his editions of Church Music, will know that on such a subject as is indicated by the title of this book he writes with the authority of a wide learning and a long experience.

But it is to be hoped that it will be read by a far larger circle than those who by profession or inclination are interested in English Cathedral Music. For it tells the story of a great achievement in which every Englishman may take pride, and of a great heritage for which every Christian should feel grateful.

Dr. Fellowes reminds us that in order to understand the Reformation it must be studied throughout the whole period from 1509 to 1662, and it is therefore natural that he should pay special attention to the period in music from Tallis to Purcell, which within itself includes the "Golden Age" of English Music (1588 to 1624) so mysteriously contemporaneous with the literary age of Shakespeare and Marlowe, of Francis Bacon and Ben Jonson

and Donne. But he does not neglect the developments that the succeeding centuries brought. He sees and tells the whole story steadily and as a whole. His wide knowledge gives him a fine sense of perspective and proportion, and if he "pigeon-holes" in a rather empirical way, the average reader may well be grateful, for each pigeon-hole is a mine of musical and biographical information. In the last pigeon-hole (Neo-Edwardian) it is pleasing to see Villiers Stanford and Parry accorded their rightful places with the greatest of English composers of Church music. The author rigidly refrains from any reference to the work of living composers; this is his affair, but we fear it will leave otherwise grateful readers with a sense of incompleteness.

Our other fear is that the book will arouse too slight interest in Free Church circles where standards of musical culture and ideals of public worship (in so far as they find expression in music) are so deplorably low. In too many of our Free Churches the musical worship is chosen by the minister (or the organist), whose only claim to do so is that "he knows what he likes". Our congregations, therefore, remain contented to "like what they know", which is too frequently the "rum and sugary *rifacimento*" and the "organ treacle" which encourage mental inertia, and the running over of their feelings in "soft melodious flow". May our churches escape the remorseless conclusion of Manning's familiar couplet!

The book is full of quite admirably printed musical illustrations, set down with a commendable lack of pedantry, in a modern notation easily to be understood by the amateur reader.

NORMAN CARTER.

SHORTER NOTICES & DESCRIPTIVE LIST.

(*Books marked * are recommended for ministerial reading.*)

It is an encouraging sign of the times that a great congregation gathers Sunday by Sunday to listen to such sermons as those in Dr. H. E. Fosdick's *Living under Tension* (S.C.M., 7s. 6d.). Dr. Fosdick maintains a high standard, and a sermon like that on "Mankind's Deepest Need—The Sense of Community" is preaching at its best. With great facility—and felicity—of exposition and illustration Dr. Fosdick applies the eternal Gospel to the life of these appalling times with courage and conviction. The reader will not always agree with him—at times we profoundly disagree. Neither is he always consistent (but what preacher is?): thus in the first sermon he commends, quoting a statement in support, British ministers for "steadfastly keeping Christ upon that judgment seat above the struggle", but in the 17th he says that if America enters the war,

> the word "sacred" will be dropped from the human vocabulary, and neither child nor woman, home, church, school, honour, nor plighted faith will be respected.

A feature of the volume is the use made of modern translations of the Bible. Here, as elsewhere, other preachers can learn from the American preacher.

Readers the world over will be glad to see Bishop Hensley Henson's *Last Words in Westminster Abbey* (Hodder, 5s.), and they will sympathize with him in that his return to the Abbey coincided with enemy bombing. The Bishop has consistently stood for "a national Christianity which was religiously inclusive and theologically liberal", and he continues to proclaim his faith in these last sermons. As an example of the Bishop's prescience we often recall a dinner at Williston Walker's at Yale in 1920. Our host said:

In 1909 we had an Englishman dining with us and sitting in your chair. In discussing international affairs he became so excited that he rose from his chair and began to walk about the room. He said there was going to be war between Britain and Germany, that it would break out in 1912, and its issue would depend on whether America entered the war or not. He proved right in every particular save the date. It was Canon Hensley Henson.

We salute a courageous preacher and a doughty warrior.

Mr. E. G. Rupp's "Christian News-Letter" book, *Is This a Christian Country?* (Sheldon Press, 1s. 6d.), will be found provocative, though somehow it leaves an uneasy feeling that the author has prejudged the question. We cannot always accept Mr. Rupp's history, but we commend his book for its stimulating qualities.

We have found Mr. Watkin W. Williams's *Life* of his grandfather, *General Sir Charles Warren* (Blackwell, 25s.), of absorbing interest. Warren had a varied career, but Mr. Williams integrates his picture, and reveals a pleasing personality from boyhood until old age, when the veteran of 86 writes "Always pretty busy", and, clad in Scout uniform, moves among the boys. Excavation in Palestine, searching in Egypt for the lost Palmer, surveying and fighting in Griqualand and Bechuanaland, in charge of the Metropolitan Police during difficult years, in the Far East, the South African War, and then a long old age devoted to the service of youth: all this, with a host of different activities, is vividly described. Warren got a "raw deal" in South Africa, especially in regard to Spion Kop, where many people blundered; if his methods had been followed from the start the campaign would have been much shorter. Warren was a practising Christian who was not ashamed of his faith: few will read this "labour of love" without acquiring an affection for him themselves.

Dr. A. Herbert Gray has written much about the relations of men and women. His new book, *Successful Marriage* (Rich & Cowan, 5s.), in the "Needs of Today" Series, has much wise counsel to give.

We give very high marks to Mr. L. A. G. Strong's *English for Pleasure* (Methuen, 5s.). Many will already know these broadcasts to schools, but all who want to write—essays, short stories, plays, or for the films—will find there is much in them by which they can profit.

The Livingstone Press has done well in making available in Britain Mrs. W. A. Wood's *Brief History of Hongkong* (5s.), published in the island. All eyes have been on Hongkong in recent weeks, and this readable history affords background for the understanding of current events.

The canteen, we learn, has come to stay, though not, we hope, the wet canteen when young people are employed. All who are in any way concerned with the running of a canteen would do well to read *Canteens at Work* (Oxford Press, 4s. 6d.), a well-illustrated practical guide by Mr. C. G. Gardiner, the Managing Director of the National Catering Service, London.

Mr. H. J. Cowell's *My Seventy Years' Pilgrimage* (Kingsgate Press, 3s. 6d.) tells of the Baptist journalist's convictions and enthusiasms—the Huguenots, Erasmus, R. L. Stevenson, John Clifford, Charles Brown—and gives extracts from his reporter's notebook during half a century.

EDITOR.

Professor E. J. Kissane's *The Book of Isaiah* (Browne & Nolan, 21s.), a work of Roman Catholic scholarship, follows the same lines as the author's *The Book of Job* (1939). It offers a critical discussion of each section,

followed by an independent translation, exegetical notes and a brief list of textual emendations. A second volume is to complete the work (from Ch. XL onwards). The distinctive feature of this volume is its valiant attempt to reclaim the *whole* of the first half of the book for Isaiah of Jerusalem. The attempt is based largely on the theory that explicit references requiring a later date (such as that to "Babylon" in XXI, 9) are due to subsequent alterations, making an Isaianic prophecy applicable to the time of the corrector. Other difficulties of content are met by patient, if unconvincing, argument, directed to prove that there is really nothing that cannot be construed as Isaianic. A further support for the desired unity is found in the claim that the strophes into which the poems are or can be divided are all of equal length, which is taken to prove the unity of the section. But even if this strophic division (which requires both the rearrangement and omission of verses) were to be allowed to the extent required, it is difficult to see how it supports the *Isaianic* authorship of the whole poem in question. We do not think that this book will be successful in reversing the general trend of critical scholarship since Duhm's time. It is not likely to convince anyone familiar with the cumulative arguments against unity, resulting from the examination of each section in the historical setting which it naturally suggests. The mere collocation of many poems into the apparent, but superficial, unity of a single MS. carries little weight against the intrinsic evidence. On the other hand, it is perhaps worth while to know the utmost that can be said by a competent scholar in support of the claim for Isaianic authorship of a particular passage—if only to compel equal care and attention to detail in maintaining the more natural interpretation.

Dr. Oesterley's indefatigable industry and dauntless productivity have for their latest example *The Jews and Judaism during the Greek Period* (S.P.C.K., 10s. 6d.). This covers ground on which his studies during many years have been engaged, and there is probably little in the substance of this volume with which he has not already dealt in his numerous, well-known publications. The thesis of the book, controlling the selection and the presentation of the material, is that the Jewish faith prepares for Christianity. After a condensed historical survey, and a fuller account of the sources, he deals with the theology, the worship, and the teachers of Judaism, concluding with a discussion of Jewish angelology and demonology. He fully recognizes the presence of extraneous influences which have contributed to these features of Judaism, and rightly claims a place for such influences in the providential revelation of divine truth. The book can be recommended to students of this important period, as bringing together in convenient form a large amount of necessary information.

H. Wheeler Robinson.

Dr. John Wright Buckham is Professor Emeritus of that live institution the Pacific School of Religion, and he has made good use of his retirement by writing a most admirable book. He calls it *The Inner World* (Harper Brothers, $3.50). The title is somewhat misleading, as the book covers very much more ground than it would indicate. Dr. Buckham describes it as "A Philosophical Introduction to Christianity", but it is really a philosophy of the self or personality, of religion, and of Christianity, and its purpose is "to go below the surface of our disrupted and disheartened time in search of reassuring underlying realities and values in human life and experience". This aim Dr. Buckham pursues through the inner world of the self and its experience into religion, theism, revelation and history. There is a good deal of psychology here, but it is psychology of a singularly commonsense

type, and it all leads up to the positive recovery of thwarted and shattered selves through an expanding personal environment and the vanquishing of evil. Dr. Buckham's treatment of these varied subjects is full of shrewd observation and keen analysis. He has a lively and interesting style and a facility for apt quotation which is sometimes overdone. But he has given us a very fine vindication of the power and necessity of religion and for the relevance of the Christian message for the modern world. Ministers should find his book especially useful and suggestive.

Religion for Today (Association Press, $2) is another American book, and is written by Dr. A. J. W. Myers, who is something of an expert in religious education. He believes that we shall need to re-interpret our Christianity if it is to live in the modern world, and that we can best do so not so much by re-interpreting Christian doctrines as by practical application of the Christian message and spirit to modern needs. He has a good deal to say about the impact of modern science and makes our flesh creep by giving us the modern astronomical view of the universe in full. The chief defect of the book is his apparent failure to re-interpret the Christian message in the light of this cosmos of science. All that he has to say, however, about modern Christian education and the application of Christian principles to social needs is very much to the point.

Towards a Theocracy, by John Kennedy (Hodder, 6s.), is another attempt to apply Christian principles to social and national needs. Dr. Kennedy writes definitely with a view to post-war reconstruction and of the part which the Christian Church must play in it. He writes mainly from the standpoint of the Scottish Church, but all that he says is applicable to the Church generally. He is dealing with a question that is becoming more and more urgent, and he has some very useful and sensible guidance to give.

Dr. Albert Schweitzer is to most people better known as a philanthropist and medical missionary than he is as a philosopher. Yet he has done some exceedingly interesting work in philosophy and has a system of his own which is well worth study. His friend and fellow-worker, Mrs. Charles Russell, has therefore done well to write a brief introduction to Schweitzer's Philosophy of Civilization under the title of *The Path of Reconstruction* (A. & C. Black, 3s. 6d.). The book is just what it professes to be—An Introduction to Schweitzer's Philosophy of Reverence for Life, and should be a real help to the discerning reader in tackling Schweitzer's larger works on the decay and restoration of civilization. Mrs. Russell's work is made the more interesting by her personal knowledge of the man and of the life he is now leading. W. B. SELBIE.

F. C. Synge's *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians* (S.C.M., 3s. 6d.) is an admirable little commentary upon the great Epistle of Unity. The writer works through the epistle verse by verse, or at most two or three verses at a time, making brief but pregnant comments. Nevertheless he keeps the central teaching of the whole well to the foreground and gives special attention to such key words as ἐκκλησία, κεφαλή, σῶμα, and πλήρωμα. While urging the dependence of *Colossians* upon *Ephesians,* the writer concludes that Paul might very well have written *Ephesians,* but is not likely to have written *Colossians.* Ministers will find the book very useful in discussion groups or as the basis for a series of exegetical talks.

In *A Study of the Gospel of Christ* (S.C.M., 5s.) Canon Spencer Leeson, the Headmaster of Winchester, gives us an outline of Christian teaching which is characterized by clear insight and gentle persuasiveness. While

God has made Himself known in many ways, we find the fullness of the revelation of His redeeming activity in the life, teaching, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. The function of the Church in the world, and especially its relation to the State, is discussed in a genuinely catholic spirit which fully recognizes the place of non-Anglican traditions within the whole Church of God.

Prof. John C. Bennett calls his *Christian Realism* (S.C.M., 6s.)

> an attempt to think through some of the most important problems of Christian life and thought in the light of insights which have come from recent developments in theology and in the light of the events that haunt our minds.

He writes "as a liberal who tries to take seriously the contribution of such thinkers as Barth, Brunner, and Reinhold Niebuhr; and as a Congregationalist who believes in the central importance of the ecumenical Church". With courage and insight he discusses the problems of sin, forgiveness, and redemption, and, while refusing to affirm the Chalcedonian definitions, places Jesus Christ, in His life, death, and resurrection at the centre of the redeeming activity of God. While guardedly affirming a close relationship between Christianity and democracy, he insists upon both the possibility and the importance of the social emphasis in Christianity:

> Even if Jesus did not Himself deal with the political and economic structure of our society, we cannot live under the influence of His teachings in our situation without translating them into concern for the political and economic structure of our society.

Prof. Bennett deals with the problem of pacifism both critically and sympathetically. He urges that while absolute pacifism may be a vocation for some individuals, it is not a self-sufficient strategy for the nation, and, in some cases, may actually be responsible for the evil it seeks to avert. The whole book is fresh and stimulating.

E. J. Price.

Two books of apologetics have recently come out of Oxford: *In Soft Garments*, by the Rt. Rev. Mgr. R. A. Knox (Burns, Oates, 6s.), 24 "conferences" given to Roman Catholic undergraduates after Mass between 1926 and 1938; and *The Screwtape Letters*, by Mr. C. S. Lewis (Centenary Press, 5s.), 31 letters from a senior devil instructing his nephew in the art of temptation, reprinted with alterations from recent issues of *The Guardian*. Mgr. Knox seems most concerned to keep his hearers Catholics ("there are no Protestants in the world under the age of five"); though he would not make it too hard, for, while "If the Reformation had really succeeded, the sinners of Europe would have lived under conditions of intolerable oppression", "If all Catholics were saints, the truth of our religion would become too glaringly obvious, and there would be no real exercise of faith in making one's submission to the Church". His argument is witty, if often perverse, and, read on its own, seems live; but the liveliness fades when compared with that of Mr. Lewis, who is younger and has the advantage of a conversion from agnosticism, which gives him bite. His approach, as from the point of view of Hell, is cleverly retained throughout, and enables him to say much which would otherwise sound pious or offensive. There are wisecracks by the way ("A woman means by Unselfishness chiefly taking trouble for others; a man means not giving trouble to others": "fatigue makes women talk more and men talk less"), but throughout the serious purpose is to reveal the wiles of the devil, and very tellingly and helpfully it is done, pricking complacency and getting well under the skin. Almost anyone would be rewarded by a thoughtful study of this book.

In future days, especially in country districts, more and more services are likely to be conducted by laymen. A book on *The Lay Preacher and His Work* (Independent Press, 2s.) has long been wanted, and the Lay Preaching Committee of the Congregational Union knew their man when they asked the Rev. A. T. S. James to write it. Readers of these pages are already familiar with the almost invariably helpful quality and style of A.T.S.J.'s writing. In this book he deals with such subjects as "Knowing the Bible", "The Inner Life", "Making a Sermon", "The Conduct of Worship", and "The Pastoral Aim of the Work". Notes on reading follow most chapters.

Roman Catholics are much more interested in their forefathers in the days of persecution than we are in ours. In Vol. III of *Old Catholic Lancashire, 1550-1850* (Burns, Oates, 6s.) Dom F. O. Blundell writes further of the many pockets of Romanism in that county, Samlesbury, St. Helens and the coast between Liverpool and Southport being among the more noted. Furness seems to have been one of those isolated areas where some held stoutly to the old faith, while others went equally vehemently for Quakerism. Lingard's presbytery at Hornby and a priest's hole at Samlesbury are among the illustrations.

The First Churchwardens' Book of Louth, 1500-1524, transcribed and edited by the late Rev. R. C. Dudding (obtainable from the University Press, Oxford, 15s.), is a labour of love in honour of the men who built the present parish church with its famous steeple. All profits are to go towards the restoration of the church.

Dr. S. Kot, at present special Polish ambassador in Moscow, last summer gave three lectures under the auspices of the Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford, and these are now published as *Five Centuries of Polish Learning* (Blackwell, 2s.). From Copernicus and Jan Laski to Mme. Curie, Funk, "who introduced the term *vitamins* into science", and Malinowski, it is a moving story of devotion to learning under ceaseless deprivation by other countries. Now again "in the provinces seized by the Germans all higher schools of every kind have been closed, all scientific societies and journals abolished"; yet "even a great nation may fall; but only a worthless one can perish" (Staszic).

The latest of Canon H. Maynard Smith's "Inspector Frost" stories is *Inspector Frost in the Background* (Faber, 7s. 6d.). The crime, a theft which Frost's son-in-law is investigating, proves an engrossing subject of conversation (excellently done) at the Cornish hotel where Frost is staying. A peace-time holiday atmosphere adds much to the book's charm.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

The Vocation of England, by Messrs. M. B. Reckitt and J. V. L. Casserley (Longmans, 5s. & 3s. 6d.), a product of the Church Union School of Sociology (1939), is an excellent book which will prove of value to readers of every denomination—and of none. It should be known to all "study-groups" on problems of reconstruction and "the new order". The authors touch nothing which they do not illuminate as they try to assess the future opportunities of England against a wise statement of past virtues and failings. Specially commendable are the sections on rural and urban England and their reintegration, economic problems, and "the challenge to the Churches".

Christian Youth Leadership in Clubs and Youth Centres, by Mr. H. C. Warner (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.), contains a useful opening statement of the needs of youth and of attempts so far made to meet them, and ends with sound

practical suggestions to Christian leaders of youth clubs (last chapter and six valuable appendices). The intermediary chapters on the theory of Christian leadership are not of the same standard. There is a statistical error (30.5 per cent for 69.5 per cent) on p. 15, and grammatical mistakes appear in the imaginary speech on p. 38. S. MYERS.

The sub-title of Professor John Foster's *Then and Now* (S.C.M., 6s.) is "The Historic Church and the Younger Churches", and he relates his study of the Early Church to his missionary experiences and more especially to the conclusions of the Madras Conference of December, 1938. The transitions from illustrations from past history to present-day events are rapid and tend to be a little bewildering, but the comparisons are always apt, and are, moreover, thought-provoking. In "The Ruin of the World and the Upbuilding of the Church" Professor Foster points out that, even if this generation has seen two wars, it has also seen, in the Madras Conference, "the Universal nature of the Church represented in the actual and the concrete". In "The Heroic Age Is Come Again", he takes first the Early Church and the Younger Churches from the standpoint of missionary enterprises, secondly Emperor Worship—with Japan as a present-day counterpart—and finally the Universal Church. In his final section, "Education for World-Churchmanship", he stresses the need for theological education, and its relation to the Universal Church. His book will be read with interest and profit by many for its practical suggestions as to the best means of approach to work in the Younger Churches and to the whole question of Church Unity. MARGARET PEEL.

All Dickens' lovers, and, it is to be hoped, many to whom he is not more than a great name, will be made happy by Arthur Machen's *A Handy Dickens* (Constable, 8s. 6d.), which, in 28 short sections, distils "the very essence" of a voluminous novelist. Happier still those readers who are led on by Mr. Machen's introduction to make the acquaintance of his own works—in particular that masterpiece of literary criticism, *Hieroglyphics*. Those who already know this work will be aware that no one is better qualified than Mr. Machen to be the anthologist of Dickens. He ranks him next to Shakespeare, but in no uncritical spirit. His love for his author is too penetrating to be blind to his defects. P. A. SPALDING.

NEW EDITIONS, REPRINTS, *ETC.*

THE Oxford University Press has been well advised to print an abridged edition of *Lord Lothian speaks to America*, especially as Sir Edward Grigg's admirable memoir has been included. For 6d. all the main speeches delivered by Lord Lothian during his memorable embassy to the United States can be read.

Cinnamon and Angelica (Dakers, 3s. 6d.) is a play written by Mr. J. Middleton Murry during the last war and first published in 1920.

The Rev. A. Vine Hall has printed a war-time edition of *Poems of a South African*, with some additional poems. It can be obtained in this country from Longmans (5s. 6d.); the proceeds go to the Governor-General's National War Fund.

LECTURES, PAMPHLETS, *ETC.*

In *The Mind of St. Paul* (Milford, 2s.), the Annual Lecture on a Master Mind, Dr. T. R. Glover has some characteristically fresh remarks on the study of great minds in general as well as of the Apostle's in particular; he seeks to show how his assurance of God in Christ enabled him to solve the

five problems which most concerned him. In *Toleration and Democracy* (Oxford Press, 1s.), the Lucien Wolf Memorial Lecture, Dr. A. D. Lindsay returns to an old love, though he now sees the comprehensiveness represented by Hooker as sharing with the Puritan theories represented by Roger Williams in responsibility for toleration in England; "the key to our modern problem lies in a reinterpretation of that most intolerant of nineteenth-century prophets, Karl Marx". The Burge Memorial Lecture was delivered by H.E. Prof. Dr. P. S. Gerbrandy under the title *The Contribution of the Churches to the Reconstruction of European Life* (S.C.M., 6d.); the Prime Minister of the Netherlands stands for an old-fashioned biblicism, not for programmes of Christian action. Six talks broadcast last November in the series "Lift Up Your Hearts!" by the Bishop of Lichfield have been published as *Things I Live By* (Cambridge Press, 6d.). *Action*, by Dr. Lionel Curtis (Oxford Press, 9d.), is a sequel to the same writer's *Decision*, and outlines the policy required for the implementing of the Atlantic Charter. *Church Reform* by P.E.P. (S.P.C.K., 1s.) is a reprint of articles from the *Church Times*, in which the finances, machinery and courts of the Church of England are sharply criticized. In *Prediction in the Light of Science and Religion*—on the title page: *History and Religion* on the cover—(S.C.M., 1s. 3d.) Prof. C. F. Rogers adds another to his series of booklets of popular apologetics, and attacks the British Israelites, the Millennial Dawn Movement, and the Second Adventists. *Spiritualism and Psychical Research*, by W.K.L.C. (S.P.C.K., 4d.), is open-minded about the latter, but disparages the former; it is finely succinct. The Cromwell Association has prepared a brief anthology from Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches, entitled *Cromwell Speaks!* (Oxford Press, 6d.), to which the Rt. Hon. Isaac Foot contributes a foreword. Nos. 5, 6, 7, 8 of the Livingstone Press's "World Issues" (3d. each) are: *Continental Christianity in War-Time*, by Dr. W. Paton; *Pacific Outposts*, by the Rev. N. Goodall; *Our Neighbours, The Jews*, by Mr. R. Smith; and *What About India?* by Miss K. Bliss.

G. F. N.

ALSO RECEIVED

A. F. Winnington Ingram. *The Secrets of Fortitude.* Longmans. 2s. 6d.

Pearl Buck. *When Fun Begins.* Methuen. 6s. Illustrated by Elizabeth Campbell. The famous novelist in a new *rôle*, as writer of a children's story.

G. Stephen Spinks. *I Have a Key.* Lindsey Press. 1s. Although borrowed from Bunyan, the title expresses a confidence the text fails to realize. The diagnosis, however, is good, though the remedy is not apparent.

The Child Jesus Painting Book. Jesus the Children's Friend Painting Book. Stories Jesus Told Painting Book. Children of the Bible Painting Book. Religious Education Press, 85 Manor Road, Wallington, Surrey. 6d. each. Pictures by Rene Cloke.

Easter Thoughts by "Allan Junior". Valentine. 3d. "Golden Thoughts" Booklet.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS.

The London Quarterly and Holborn (Jan.). Two important articles are Dr. W. F. Howard's "The Jewish Background of the Gospels" and Dr. W. F. Lofthouse's "Have the Values a Value for Ethics?". The Brontës have their tale told by the Rev. W. Bardsley Brash, Thomas Bilney his by the Rev. H. S. Darby.

The Hibbert Journal (Jan.). "What Russia Can Teach Us" is by Miss M. D. M. Petre, who writes as a Roman Catholic and mid-Victorian. Dr. A. Cobban traces "The Triumph of Pessimism" from Hume onwards, Prof. J. Laird examines "Samuel Alexander's Theism", using unpublished manuscripts. Prof. H. H. Rowley and Fr. C. Lattey, S.J., present a Protestant and Catholic view of the Lord's Supper respectively.

Bulletin of the John Rylands Library (Vol. 26). Most readers of this journal will turn first to Dr. T. W. Manson's "The Corinthian Correspondence". There are many other valuable papers—Dr. H. J. Chaytor's "The Medieval Reader and Textual Criticism", Dr. H. J. Fleure's "Guernsey—A Social Study", Mr. A. R. Myres's "The Captivity of a Royal Witch", Dr. R. Niklaus's *Les Pensées Philosophiques de Diderot,* Mr. J. L. Paton's "The Tercentenary of Comenius's Visit to England", Prof. T. H. Pear's "Psychoanalysis and Normal Psychology", Dr. Edward Robertson's "Temple and Torah", and the Editor's "The Dawn of the Revival of Learning".

The Yale Review (Sept.). Thirtieth anniversary issue, and an exceptionally fine number. Wilbur Cross, the founder, writes on "Our First Thirty Years", John Chamberlain on "Looking Ahead". Of outstanding interest are José Ortega y Gasset's "Kant and the Modern German Mind", and Arnold Wolfers' survey of "Two Years of the Second World War".

The Yale Review (Dec.). Thornton Wilder opens with "After a Visit to England", Julian S. Huxley looks "Towards a New British Democracy", Ralph Kent, former Assistant Director of the American College there, writes "The Swastika Flies Over Athens".

The Harvard Theological Review (Oct.). The three articles are C. C. McCown's "Codex and Roll in the New Testament", M. L. W. Laistner's "The Western Church and Astrology during the Early Middle Ages", and Perry Miller's "Solomon Stoddard, 1643-1729", Increase Mather's protagonist in the Halfway Covenant controversy.

Anglican Theological Review (Oct.). Out of seven articles, the following may be mentioned: "The Present Doctrinal Crisis" by Pierce Butler, "Law and Religion in the Ancient World as Illustrated in the Bible", by J. A. Montgomery, and "Seminary Study and Practical Training" by T. J. Bigham, Jr.

Theological Studies (Dec.). Fr. L. J. McGinley argues lucidly and vehemently against "Form-Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives" in the first of a series of seven articles, Fr. J. E. Coleran supports the Sethite theory of "The Sons of God in Genesis 6^2", Fr. M. J. Donnelly presents "The Theory of R. P. Maurice de la Taille, S.J., on the Hypostatic Union" as "created actuation by Uncreated Act in the substantial order".

The Modern Churchman (Jan.). The Editor has some searching criticisms of Roman Catholic intolerance, the Rev. J. C. Hardwick considers "Science: the Enslaver and the Liberator", the Rev. D. E. H. Whiteley asks "Has Christian Rational Humanism been refuted?".

Religion in Education (Jan.). The first four articles are: "The Board Take Action" by the Editor, "Christian Doctrine and the Child" by the Bishop of Liverpool, "Moral Training in English Schools" by the Headmaster of Cotham Secondary School, Bristol, and "Forty Years with the Gospels" by the Rev. E. L. Allen.

The Expository Times (Jan.-Feb.). The Rev. C. D. Bacon writes on "Man's Destiny Hereafter", the Rev. R. W. Stewart warns against "The Overestimate of Liturgy", the Rev. R. J. Wedderspoon discusses "Reconstruction Problems: IV, A Challenge that must be Faced", Dr. C. J. Cadoux answers the question "Is It Possible to Write a Life of Christ?" with an affirmative.

The International Review of Missions (Jan.). The bulk of the number consists of the Editors' annual survey. Miss E. D. Spicer writes on "China and India: a New Chapter?".

Agenda (Jan.). This is a new venture, "a quarterly journal of reconstruction", published at 6s. by Milford for the London School of Economics and Political Science, and edited by Prof. G. N. Clark. Subjects discussed include: "Reconstruction and Agriculture" by Sir Daniel Hall, "Principles of Land Utilization" by Dr. L. Dudley Stamp, "The Finance of Education" by Lady (E. D.) Simon, "The 'Failure' of the League of Nations" by Prof. C. A. W. Manning, and "The Future of Ethiopia" by Miss Margery Perham.

In Extremis (Sept.-Nov.). Pfr. J.-L. Leuba writes of *La dignité humaine: un legs de Dostoievski,* Herr O. Bruder on *Die Bedrohung der Kirche,* Dr. K. Barth presents an *Explication du catéchisme de Calvin,* Dr. F. Kaufmann discusses the relations between *Medizin u. Besessenheit,* in the latter of which he believes as a Christian, not as a psychiatrist.

The Review of Religion (Nov.). This Columbia University journal specializes in book reviews, to which more than 60 pp. of this issue are given. Some of the longer reviews are adequate, and the section devoted to periodicals is useful, but naturally many books receive no mention, and the selection places heavy responsibility upon the Editor.

G. F. N.